

Mr. McKELLAR. That course would be entirely agreeable to me. I should very much prefer it, because there are other facts that I desire to submit to the Senate. I agree with the Senator that this is a very important matter. If we are to establish a ship subsidy, we ought to come out and establish it by law of Congress. It ought not to be established in this left-handed way.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will move a recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

RECESS

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 16, 1926, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, December 15, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, day unto day Thy Providence uttereth speech. Thou dost throw open the doors of every morning and breathe Thy life and give Thy light. Do Thou accept the gratitude of all our hearts. May the constancy of such divine care make urgent appeal to our moral sense, strengthen our faith and deepen our affections. Teach us how to employ all those privileges which give us strength and courage, and determine wise and intelligent government. Be with any who may be against the sharp edges of affliction. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution

Whereas in the glad atmosphere of the nearing Christmas all hearts should be attuned to the cause of carrying comfort and cheer to every American fireside; and,

Whereas it is within the power of the Congress to carry comfort at this Christmas time to many American hearths whereon the fires of hope are now flaming but flickeringly: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that one-half of all the legislative hours between this hour and the lighting of the candles on the nearing Christmas eve shall be wholly devoted to consideration of legislation remedial of present ills upon the body of agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know under what rule, or clause of a rule, a resolution of this kind is privileged to be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska does not present it as a privilege, but he asks unanimous consent.

Mr. SNELL. I think, under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Nebraska under the rules of the House.

Mr. SNELL. The Chair understands that I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves the right to object.

Mr. HOWARD. It is very kind of the Chair to recognize me, but I am not very strong this morning, and I have to speak for 15 minutes on another subject. I desire to ask a question of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York has objected to the consideration of this Christmas resolution in behalf of agriculture, and the question I would like to ask is this: The gentleman occupies an official position in the House—does he object personally or in his official capacity?

Mr. SNELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska why we should consider agriculture at this time. I do not understand that the Committee on Agriculture has made any report, and I reserved the right to object in my personal capacity.

Mr. HOWARD. And not in the gentleman's official capacity? In either event I know that I am compelled to yield to the brutal majority, and I yield gracefully. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I have previously been granted permission to speak for 15 minutes this morning. I deferred it yesterday because I was not strong enough, and I am not very strong this morning, and I prefer to speak now for the purpose for which I obtained the time, and I will speak with reference to agriculture later.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska for 15 minutes.

BANKING—NEBRASKA GUARANTY FUND

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker and fellows of the House, I secured time to address you briefly this morning for the sole purpose of calling to your attention a bill now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House, the bill H. R. 13501, introduced for the purpose of carrying to the people of the whole country a measure of the boon and blessing enjoyed by the people of my own wonderful Nebraska with reference to the security of their deposits in the banks.

Thomas Jefferson said that the highest duty of a Member of the Congress was to regard himself as a representative of the whole people of the Republic, rather than the representative alone of the people of the State which commissioned him here. In my loyalty to the Jeffersonian principle I am trying to occupy that attitude now in the introduction of this bill. Had I at heart the interests of my Nebraska people alone, perhaps I had not introduced the bill; but I want to be large enough to consider the interests of the people of all the States, and I want to do my small part in carrying to them somewhat of the blessings we in Nebraska enjoy because of the fact that we have a law in our State which for 16 years has absolutely guaranteed the deposits of the people in the banks, and under the terms of which no man nor woman nor child has ever lost a dollar of deposits in these banks.

Oh, my colleagues, I have just been getting some testimony this morning from the Comptroller of the Currency, and it ought to make every one of us ashamed that we in our representative capacity, having the power to forbid such conditions, should have so long permitted such a fraud to be practiced upon the American people as we do permit by giving to a man, or to an assembly of men, authority to go out into the world under the name of an institution, recognized as a part and parcel of the American Government, and then spoliage the people who display their confidence in that man or association of men because of the fact that we have given to that man or the association the name of our Government under which to operate.

I wonder how many of us have ever taken the trouble to ascertain what has been the loss inflicted upon the American people by incompetent or criminal national-bank operations during the past five years. Here is a remarkable statement from the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Stearns. The statement shows the losses sustained by creditors of insolvent national banks in receiverships that have been completely liquidated during the years 1921 to 1926, inclusive, and also shows another shameful situation which ought to merit our attention; namely, that during the past five years 450 national banks have gone into receiverships. How many of those receiverships do you suppose are still in operation? How many of those banks do you suppose have been liquidated under those receiverships? The paltry number of 62 banks has been liquidated in five years, and 378 of them are still in course of liquidation. I could not get from the comptroller anything about the losses of those 378 banks not liquidated, but I have a right to strike an average, and regarding the 378 banks still in the hands of receivers, and in comparison with the 62 which have been liquidated, I discover that in five years the losses of the American people who deposited their money in the national banks on the faith of the Government, as most men do, because they believe the Government stands behind our banks which bear a governmental name, amounts to the enormous sum of \$93,000,000. Oh, perhaps that does not mean much to us. We speak of millions very glibly. They do not mean anything more to us than a powder puff, but \$93,000,000 of the deposits of the American people utterly lost to them through their own placing of confidence in banks that bear the sacred name of the Republic ought to attract our attention.

The statement of Mr. Stearns, to which I have referred, I place in the RECORD at this point.

DECEMBER 14, 1926.

Statement of losses sustained by creditors of insolvent national banks in receiverships that have been completely liquidated during the years 1921 to 1926, inclusive

| Year | Number of liquidations | Liabilities to creditors | Amounts paid creditors | Losses sustained by creditors |
|-------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1921 | 14 | \$4,085,035 | \$2,737,604 | \$1,347,431 |
| 1922 | 11 | 3,244,714 | 1,976,009 | 1,268,705 |
| 1923 | 13 | 2,362,876 | 940,584 | 1,422,292 |
| 1924 | 19 | 7,644,445 | 5,334,843 | 2,309,602 |
| 1925 | 5 | 804,850 | 804,850 | — |
| Total | 62 | 18,141,920 | 11,793,890 | 6,348,030 |

On November 1, 1926, there were 378 active receiverships, with assets of \$261,310,078. None of these banks were included in the above statement, and no dependable estimate of loss to creditors can be furnished.

In the State of Nebraska during these years two national banks have been completely liquidated; one at Sidney, Nebr., with a loss to creditors of \$173,651, and another at Chappell, Nebr., with a loss to creditors of \$455,303. These losses are included in the total losses given above.

E. W. STEARNS, Deputy Comptroller.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOWARD. Certainly.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the information given the gentleman indicate any good reason why these receiverships are not closed more hurriedly?

Mr. HOWARD. Unhappily I was unable to get any information on that particular subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have often heard the statement that this Nebraska bank guaranty law of ours is an attack upon the national banks and intended to be regarded as such by the people who operate the State banks. That is not true. I could not stand here in good faith and presume knowingly to offer legislation which I thought would injure my fellow men, and particularly the fellows of my own personal household, because indeed they happen to own a little interest in national banks; and I want to submit here in this connection a series of questions and answers prepared by Mr. Gutru, the president of the State bank at Newman Grove, Nebr., making clear and explicit to anyone who would care to understand just what this Nebraska guaranty law of ours is and how it operates; and at this point, under permission to do so, I insert those questions propounded and answered by Mr. Gutru as a part of my remarks. They are as follows:

Question. What is the object of this questionnaire on the subject of the "Guaranty of bank deposits"?

Answer. Its object is education. So many do not understand what it means, whom it protects, and who pays for the protection that it seems timely and proper to set out the facts.

Question. Do the State banks pay for the cost of the protection given depositors under the guaranty law?

Answer. The State banks pay the entire cost of the protection given to depositors, and because they do pay this heavy tax for the benefit of all they feel they are entitled to have the people whom they protect know that they are protected and that the State banks pay the entire cost of it.

Question. Then what is the Nebraska guaranty fund law?

Answer. It is a law creating in effect a gigantic insurance company, composed of all of the State banks of Nebraska, for the purpose of insuring bank deposits.

Question. Has the law been in effect long enough to prove its practical value to the State?

Answer. Yes; it has been in effect 16 years, and during that time not a single depositor has lost a single dollar in a single State bank in Nebraska.

Question. Has there been a money panic or depression during that period?

Answer. Yes; from 1920 to 1923 was probably the greatest financial depression ever known in the history of this country.

Question. Did this put a heavy strain on the guaranty fund?

Answer. Yes; but the guaranty fund proved capable of sustaining every strain that was put upon it, and successfully met every emergency that arose during, before, and since that distressing period.

Question. Did the guaranty fund pay any losses to depositors during that period?

Answer. It certainly did. More than \$11,000,000 were paid to depositors in banks that were liquidated who would have otherwise lost their money had there been no guaranty fund.

Question. What is the condition of the guaranty fund at the present time?

Answer. The guaranty fund at the present time has more than \$10,000,000 of resources, which are gradually being made available for the payment of losses, and in addition to this large reserve it has the power to raise more than one and one-half millions in assessments each year against the State banks of Nebraska. These funds are ample to meet all possible losses that may occur.

Question. How are the assessments made for maintaining the State guaranty fund?

Answer. The law authorizes the secretary of the department of trade and commerce to make an annual levy on the average deposits of the State banks of not more than one-half of 1 per cent, plus one-tenth of 1 per cent, which makes an aggregate assessment of six-tenths of 1 per cent on the average deposits of all the State banks of Nebraska. The average deposits of State banks at the last report amounted to nearly \$290,000,000.

Question. Is this method, then, similar to the processes of levying taxes on property for the payment of the running expenses of the Government?

Answer. It is.

Question. Is it a fact, as often claimed, that the guaranty law protecting depositors in State banks from loss actually saved the State from financial disaster during the recent deflation period?

Answer. It is beyond question a fact, because Nebraska has recovered from the depression of that period with greater rapidity than has any other neighboring State which has not had the benefit of a practical guarantee of deposits law.

Question. Do the depositors in State banks have absolute confidence in the protection of their deposits?

Answer. They certainly do. There has never been a case of a run on a State bank caused by uneasiness, misrepresentation, or fear of the safety of their funds since the law was enacted in 1909. Depositors in State banks do not withdraw their deposits from fear of loss, no matter what may be the condition of the bank, for the reason that they know beyond question of doubt their deposits will be paid in full either by the bank itself or by the State from the guaranty fund in the event the bank is unable to do so.

Question. Is it a fact, then, that when a depositor places his money in a State bank, that all of the State banks in Nebraska guarantee its return to him, regardless of what may happen?

Answer. In effect that is exactly the situation. Nearly a thousand State banks will be taxed by the State annually to the extent of six-tenths of 1 per cent on their average deposits until every dollar deposited in any failed bank is paid in full.

Question. Can there be any greater security than this given to a depositor?

Answer. No better security is known to have yet been devised to protect a depositor from loss. It has survived 16 years, including three years of the most depressed financial conditions ever known in the history of the country. It is safe to assume, therefore, that it will survive through the piping times of peace and prosperity that lie ahead of us.

Question. How many State banks are there in Nebraska?

Answer. Approximately 913.

Question. How many national banks are there?

Answer. Approximately 170.

Question. Does the guaranty fund protect the depositors against loss in national banks?

Answer. It does not. The State does not have control over national banks. The law only applies to State banks, and deposits only are insured against loss in State banks.

Question. Are the national-bank depositors protected by a national-bank guaranty law?

Answer. They are not so protected. There is no such thing as a national guaranty law affecting national banks.

Question. Why has there not been enacted a national guaranty law protecting national-bank depositors?

Answer. Because national bankers, as a rule, are opposed to the passage of such a law and Congress has not seen fit to overcome their opposition.

Question. Why do they oppose it?

Answer. Because they do not wish to pay for the expense of maintaining it. It costs a great deal of money to insure the depositors against loss in banks. The State banks in Nebraska have paid up to date over \$11,000,000.

Question. Does the Federal reserve act in any way protect depositors from loss in national banks in case of failure?

Answer. It does not in the least. The Federal reserve is a great credit reservoir for national banks as going concerns, and is of great service to the country. It mobilizes the reserves of national banks and makes them available for credit, so that national banks can borrow money freely from it, thus enabling them to meet the demands of their customers in an emergency, but it does not pay depositors in case of loss or failure.

Question. Do not national bankers sometimes claim that it does?

Answer. Some may do so, but they do it through ignorance or in an attempt to mislead their customers. High-class national bankers make no such false claims, nor do they wish to profit through a misrepresentation of that kind.

Question. Has the Federal reserve act strengthened sound banking among national banks by exacting better practices?

Answer. It certainly has. It has made examinations of banks more rigid than formerly and has created higher ideals of banking than formerly existed.

Question. Has the guaranty fund law strengthened sound banking in the State banks by exacting better practices?

Answer. It certainly has. As a result of banks being compelled to guarantee each other's losses in case of failure, they have demanded stricter and more rigid examinations, and have insisted upon licenses to bankers being issued only to men of high character and known integrity.

Question. Then if the banking situation has been greatly strengthened by the guarantee fund law and the Federal reserve act, is there any use of a guarantee of deposits law any longer?

Answer. There is as much use for a guarantee of deposits law as there is for fire insurance. One can get along without either, but he sleeps better for having them, and in case of loss he is better able to go ahead with his business as a result of being able to have his money returned to him in full.

Question. What effect has the guarantee law had on the prosperity of the State?

Answer. Without the guarantee of deposits law, which has made possible the payment to the depositors of banks that have liquidated in Nebraska during the last 16 years their deposits in full, thousands of people would have been more or less impoverished through their losses, but this has been entirely avoided and absolute confidence maintained, enabling the people to go on with their business without any financial disturbances whatever. When a merchant's store is destroyed by fire the insurance he carries enables him to immediately replace his stock and continue his business. When a bank fails anywhere in the State system all of the depositors are paid in full out of the guarantee fund, with the result that the depositors continue their business without any interruption. The confidence of the people in their banks is maintained and their money is constantly flowing through the banks for the purpose of carrying on the commerce of the State without any interruption. Industry is stimulated with the funds that are constantly available in the banks, and the prosperity of the State has gone forward without let-up or hindrance in spite of the greatest price depression in all history. No surrounding State has prospered to the extent that Nebraska has. That has been the effect of the maintenance of public confidence in our financial institutions through the payment of depositors in full for every dollar they had on deposit in State banks that were closed.

Question. What is the financial situation now in Nebraska?

Answer. It was never sounder or better than at the present moment. Deposits in banks are increasing at a very rapid rate, indicating that the people are accumulating a surplus and gradually paying their debts. The banks never have been in such a sound position as they are now, and there has never been a time when there was more available credit for business and industry than at the present.

Question. What would have been the effect on the State if there had been no guarantee of deposits law?

Answer. The effect would have been similar to that existing in one or two neighboring States, that can not with propriety be mentioned, whose financial status is now in a state of chaos as a result of the lack of confidence due wholly to the fact that there is no insurance backing their financial institutions.

Question. Does the law in Nebraska recognize State banks as depositories for public funds?

Answer. It does. Every State bank may be used as a depository for public funds for unlimited amounts without bonds of any kind.

Question. Does the State law authorize national banks as depositories without bonds?

Answer. It does not. A national bank must give bonds for public funds held on deposit, because its deposits are not insured as they are in State banks under the guaranty law.

Question. Do national bankers object to the Nebraska guaranty law?

Answer. Some of them do. Others recognize the great value of the law as a stabilizer of the financial situation in the State and heartily approve it. Those who do not have the broader view try to discredit the guaranty law so as to avoid its competition, notwithstanding the fact it has made Nebraska prosperous beyond that of any of its sister States not so protected. The solvent banks of the State have paid to depositors of failed banks more than \$11,000,000 in losses, which is a great sacrifice for them to make in the interests of the maintenance of the high honor and trust that banks deserve as depositories of the people.

Question. Is this statement concerning national banks a criticism?

Answer. It is not a criticism. Our national banking system ranks with any system of banking known in the world. The only object of this educational program is to acquaint the people with the two kinds

of commercial banks we have in this State—namely, the State and National—and to make clear the fact that the Nebraska guaranty law protects only the depositors in Nebraska State banks and not in national banks.

Contrary to statements made in some quarters, the happy fact appears that there is no controversy at all between the State and National bankers in Nebraska. Every intelligent national banker—and most of them in Nebraska are intelligent—applauds the stability of his State bank competitors and sincerely believes that the small number of national-bank failures in Nebraska, compared with some other States, has been largely due to the general stability of the banking situation in that State, as a result of a guaranty law which really does guarantee deposits. It will be noticed by a careful reading of the above questionnaire that the State banker who put out that questionnaire took no issue at all with his national banking neighbors, but spoke generously and kindly of them.

I take it for granted that every person who has made even small study of the workings of our splendid Nebraska law to guarantee deposits in the banks has long ago dismissed opposition to the good principle involved. It is a matter of common knowledge that there is no bank which of itself could stand a run by depositors. And it takes so little to start a run of that kind; a whisper, a bare suspicion has often been sufficient. Such whisper and suspicion may cause what might be called "a panic," an apprehension on the part of the depositors as to the safety of their deposits. Many a bank which in fact was solvent has been driven into liquidation by baseless rumors. One great value of the guaranty law is that it allays that apprehension as to the safety of the deposits.

There would be no panic nor run on a bank as long as the depositors are assured that they are protected by a guaranty law. I do not believe we have had anything in the nature of such a run on a State bank in Nebraska since our guaranty law was enacted.

It has been well said that a satisfied, contented ex-soldier is the best bulwark between any government and internal disturbances by dissatisfied elements. And it follows naturally that the best bulwark between any bank and the day of trouble is the bulwark of satisfied and contented depositors. I think I might best illustrate this by recital of the story of Jim Glibberson. He had \$4 on deposit in his home bank. He had heard rumors regarding the solvency of the bank, and so he hurried inside to get his money. He told the cashier he wanted his money, and then added:

If I kin git it, I don't want it; but if I can't git it, I have got to have it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the United States Government demand a bond for any money that it deposits in the national banks or in other banks?

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, yes; the Government does. The Government is always protected by a bond.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But the people who deposit the money in those banks are not?

Mr. HOWARD. No. The innocent bystanders—the depositors—are not protected.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that I have that sort of a bill pending, and that I made a speech here last session upon it; but my bill requires each bank to give a bond to protect the depositors. In my State and in the gentleman's State, if a city or the State or a school district deposits money, you have to give a bond to protect their deposits. My bill requires each bank to give a blanket surety bond to protect all deposits, just as you protect the State, the school, or the Government deposits.

Mr. HOWARD. But under the law of Nebraska no State bank is required to give a bond for any of the deposits, because all deposits are guaranteed.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. What liability does each one of the individual banks assume for the responsibility of all of the banks as to deposits?

Mr. HOWARD. In the first place, each bank becoming a part and parcel of the guaranty system is required to deposit in the Nebraska guaranty fund a certain percentage of the average daily deposits of the bank for the past year. If a new bank comes in, it puts up 4 per cent of its capital. All of those deposits remain in the contributing bank, subject to the call of the banking department, and the secretary of the Banking Board is permitted to levy one-quarter of 1 per cent upon the

average daily deposits for the past year, or one-half of 1 per cent if an emergency should arise. Those emergencies do not arise very often. The bank guaranty fund now has something in excess of \$12,000,000 to the good, I think; and it is working so splendidly that I suggest that you gentlemen, if you have people in your home States who are uneasy about their deposits, who can not sleep very well at night, should have them send their deposits to Nebraska, where there is naught to make afraid, naught to drive away sleep. It might be of interest to note at this point that there are one or two States near us in which the orgy of broken banks has been a little larger than in any others. I shall not name the States I have in mind, but one of them is not very far east of us. It has been estimated that at this time we have something over \$5,000,000 of deposits in our banks from the people of that particular State. I know one of my own relatives is acting in a fiduciary capacity as the guardian of a little child. He has some \$12,000 of guardianship money. He got nervous. He lives in Iowa—I might just as well tell the truth [laughter]; and I have nothing against Iowa—I was born there, by mistake. But it is a fact, and a splendid fact, gentlemen, that the guaranty law of Nebraska is not only a blessing to our people, but it has reached out and blessed others who will come in and share its blessings; and in these glad Christmas days I am tendering to the people of your States—for unfortunately you have no such guaranty—I am tendering to you an opportunity of carrying a Christmas greeting to them and to tell them to bring their money to Nebraska, where it will be safe. [Applause.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Has the gentleman in mind any particular bank in Nebraska?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, may I have opportunity to reply to the courteous question of the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

Mr. HOWARD. What was the question?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I asked if the gentleman had in mind any particular bank.

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, yes; I have, but then it would be personal if I should designate the banks. So I must not designate any; they are all so good. [Laughter.] Now, that is all, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter.] I ask unanimous consent, I thought I had it, to insert at the proper place the valuable official evidence which I offered to the House a moment ago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6238) entitled "An act to amend the immigration act of 1924," and requests a conference with the House thereon, and had ordered that Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KEYES, Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING, and Mr. HARRIS be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12316) entitled "An act to amend the Panama Canal act and other laws applicable to the Canal Zone, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had ordered that Mr. EDGE, Mr. GREENE, and Mr. WALSH of Montana be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ATTITUDE OF UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU TOWARD EX-SERVICE MEN

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a letter from a prominent citizen in my district in reference to a Veterans' Bureau case.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asked to have a letter inserted.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the letter?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the review of a case before the Veterans' Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States Veterans' Bureau is an independent bureau of the Government, responsible not to the Interior Department, War Department, or any other department administered by a Cabinet officer, but responsible only to the President of the United States. It is patent that the President, with his enormous responsibilities and multi-

licity of cares, can not give the sort of attention that is needed to this bureau, with the result that the United States Veterans' Bureau does very much as it pleases.

From nearly eight years of experience of presenting ex-service men's claims to the Veterans' Bureau, I have come to this conclusion, namely, that the Veterans' Bureau is mostly a military organization, officered and to a large extent manned by soldiers and ex-soldiers. The military personnel has not, however, been in sympathy with its former comrades who are unfortunate in health, but has, on the contrary, leaned over backward in its efforts to be a part of the Government.

I have consulted many of my colleagues and find that they, too, have suffered the embarrassment of seeing claims delayed and denied, claims that needed quick and efficient treatment and also a touch of sympathetic treatment to prevent suffering, hardship, and even death. It is becoming common knowledge that the Veterans' Bureau holds down its regional managers and medical officers, instructing them to fight cases where compensation is sought, oftentimes denying them on technicalities; that it continually seeks to cut down compensation to veterans by frequent examinations, which are almost without exception conducted in a far from sympathetic manner. In fact, to speak plainly, medical officers so frequently adopt a hard-boiled attitude toward broken-down claimants, seemingly wanting to scare them off. All this seems to be in an effort to save money and make a record of economy. The bureau is continually turning back money into the Treasury that was appropriated by Congress to salvage and aid these men who were taken from all walks of life and thrown into the first line of defense, to take whatever might come to them. Not long ago nearly \$70,000,000 was returned to the Treasury by this bureau, while ex-service men all over the country were living on charity or dependent on relatives, rather than longer fight for their claims, or, if they continued to fight, it got them nowhere.

I believe in economy of government. But the United States Veterans' Bureau is the last place, absolutely, that I would begin such economy, and I would look upon money saved by such methods as unworthy of the ideals of this country. Congress appropriates liberally for these ex-service men, and wants them taken care of liberally. But the money is not all used; the wishes of Congress in this regard are ignored, and our individual pleadings and representations seem not to be heeded.

Just as one example of the many cases that have stirred me in my connection with the bureau, in defense of my constituents, I wish to record here correspondence between the Veterans' Bureau and Dr. C. O. Beardsley, of Ottawa, Ohio, concerning the claim of Julius C. Rothman, C-641456. There are also affidavits of witnesses, and it is here shown upon what flimsy grounds a decision of the bureau can sometimes be based, and how such a decision can be shown up by a competent physician:

LABORATORY REPORT

Name of patient, Mr. Julius Rothman, room No. 505.

OTHER LABORATORY EXAMINATIONS

Sputum: Microscopic examination shows hemolytic streptococcus and staphylococcus.

H. J. BALLINGER, M. D., Pathologist.
S. M. C., Technician.

Re: C-641456.

Julius C. Rothman, deceased.

STATE OF OHIO,

Putnam County, ss.:

I, B. L. Griffiths, being first duly sworn depose and say that on October 30, 1926, I accompanied Mrs. Elizabeth Deck Goedde and Dr. C. O. Beardsley to Toledo, Ohio, and was present when they interviewed Dr. D. J. Clark, of Toledo, in regard to the claim of Julius C. Rothman, deceased.

Doctor Clark stated that he was not acquainted with Julius C. Rothman, had never seen him, and had never treated him up until January 16, 1920, at 9.30 a. m., when he was called to see him at his place of residence at the Tompkins Hotel, Toledo, Ohio. Doctor Clark further stated that as soon as he saw the claimant, Julius C. Rothman, sitting in the hotel lobby, he saw that he was seriously ill, and took him to the Mercy Hospital in his own automobile, where the said Julius C. Rothman died January 17, 1920, at 5.30 a. m.

Affiant further said that the said Dr. D. J. Clark further stated that he knew nothing about the history or the illness of the said Julius C. Rothman prior to January 16, 1920, at 9.30 a. m.

B. L. GRIFFITHS.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 8th day of November, 1926.

[SEAL]

FRONA BRINKMAN,
Notary Public.

Re: C-641,456, Julius C. Rothman.

STATE OF OHIO,

Putnam County, ss.:

I, B. L. Griffiths, being first duly sworn, depose and say that on October 30, 1926, I accompanied Elizabeth Deck Goedde, the Red Cross worker, of Putnam County, Ohio, and Dr. C. O. Beardsley, of Ottawa, Ohio, to Toledo, Ohio, and was present when they interviewed Dr. L. D. Miller, of 620 Summit Street, Toledo, Ohio, in regard to the claim of Julius C. Rothman, deceased.

I further state that after the said Dr. L. D. Miller consulted his records he stated that he had neither record nor recollection of ever having treated the said Julius C. Rothman, deceased. He said that since he (said Dr. L. D. Miller) returned from the Army, in 1919, he specialized in G. U. diseases and allowed no man to come in his consultation office without making a card record, and he referred all other cases to other doctors.

BEN L. GRIFFITHS.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 9th day of November, 1926.

[SEAL.]

FRONA BRINKMAN,
Notary Public.

(Lawrence D. Miller, M. D., suites 8 and 9, Summit and Charry Market Building)

TOLEDO, OHIO, October 11, 1926.

MARY C. ROTHMAN,

216 South Railroad Avenue, Ottawa, Ohio.

DEAR MADAM: I did not attend Julius C. Rothman. We have two other Doctor Millers in Toledo—Dr. L. A. Miller, Spitzer Building, and Dr. C. S. Miller, 2404 Cherry Street.

Respectfully,

(Signed) L. D. MILLER, M. D.

STATE OF OHIO,

Lucas County, ss.:

I, Roland Nebulung, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that I am the day clerk at Hotel Tompkins; that I have knowledge of the fact that Julius C. Rothman was suffering with what appeared to me to be a bad cold. He had a hacking cough, and we told him here that he ought to go to a physician. He seemed to be doctoring himself. This condition existed for some time before he went to the hospital, for at least one month.

Affiant further states that he has no interest in this case whatsoever and is not related to claimant.

ROLAND NEBULUNG.

Before me, a notary public in and for Lucas County, Ohio, personally appeared Roland Nebulung and acknowledged the signing of this instrument as his free act and will and for the purpose set forth.

[SEAL.]

H. C. HATCHER,
Notary Public.

(My commission expires March 11, 1929.)

Re: C: 641456, Julius Charles Rothman.

STATE OF OHIO,

Lucas County, ss.:

I, Mrs. Sophia Tompkins, of 708 Superior Street, Toledo, Ohio, being first duly sworn, depose and says:

That she is the wife of Fred F. Tompkins, the owner and proprietor of Hotel Tompkins, located at 708 Superior Street, Toledo, Ohio.

That she was well acquainted with Julius C. Rothman prior to his entering the service of the United States Army, and that he was in good health. She has personal knowledge of this from the fact that he lived at the said Tompkins Hotel several years before entering the service, and that after his discharge from the service of the United States Army, on January 7, 1919, he returned to the said Tompkins Hotel, where he lived up until he was removed to the Mercy Hospital on January 16, 1920, and died January 17, 1920.

Affiant further says that she noticed that when Julius Charles Rothman returned to the Tompkins Hotel in January, 1919, after he was discharged, that he was not in good health. He was thin, he was emaciated, and looked quite frail. He had flushed cheeks. He had a regular hacking cough, and at times a spell of bad coughing. It was very noticeable when passing through the halls when he was lying down in his room, but I also noticed it when he was in the lobby. This coughing continued from the time he returned from the Army until he was taken to the hospital.

Affiant says she often suggested that he see a physician, but that he was of an uncomplaining nature, would not give up, would not allow her to do anything for him, but said that he would see a physician, and affiant says that it looked like tuberculosis.

Affiant further states that she has no interest in this case whatsoever and not related.

Mrs. SOPHIA TOMPKINS.

Before me a notary public in and for Lucas County, Ohio, personally appeared Mrs. Sophia Tompkins and acknowledged the signing of this instrument to be her own free will and act and for the purpose set forth.

[SEAL.]

H. C. HATCHER,
Notary Public.

(My commission expires March 11, 1929.)

TOLEDO, OHIO, October 30, 1926.

This is to certify that I attended Mr. Julius C. Rothman January 16, 9.30 a. m., to January 17, 1920, 5.30 a. m., and that he died from influenza pneumonia at 5.30 a. m. January 17, 1920.

Dr. D. J. CLARK.

(P. S.: This is all I know of this case.)

Dr. D. J. C.

STENOGRAPHER NOTE

Please make four copies—

One for the Red Cross office.

One for Charles Thompson, Congressman elect.

One for the United States Veterans' Bureau.

One for Dr. C. O. Beardsley, the author.

Reply to: F A B A, 9/9/26, Rothman, Julius C. (deceased), C-641456. Hon. F. T. HINES,

Director of United States Veterans' Bureau,
Washington, D. C.

SUMMARY

The evidence already in your hands, with your letter of September 9, 1926, the within letters and affidavits have swept the foundation of contention from beneath the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau in this case.

Lines 15, 16, and 17 are an admission that Doctor Clark says this was a case of tuberculosis. Doctor Clark's statement attached says he knows nothing about this case prior to his last few hours (20) of sickness.

B. L. Griffiths, who interviewed Doctor Clark, makes an affidavit which is attached.

Lines 10, 11, 12, and 13 give wrong date of death. Rothman died 1 year and 10 days after discharge from Army, January 17, 1920.

Dr. L. W. Miller, 620 Summit Street, Toledo, Ohio, in a written statement denies ever treating Julius C. Rothman at any time.

B. L. Griffith, who interviewed Dr. L. W. Miller, October 30, 1926, makes affidavit, which is attached.

Julius C. Rothman made his home at the Tompkins Hotel, Toledo, Ohio. He lived there before going to the Army and registered at the hotel the day after discharge, January 8, 1919.

Mrs. S. Tompkins makes an affidavit of Rothman's condition during the last year of residence at this hotel, copy attached.

The clerk of the Tompkins Hotel knew Rothman and made affidavit, copy attached.

Lines 19, 20, and 21, too much difference between Doctor Clark's examination and hospital record, which was made one hour later. See affidavit of B. L. Griffith, made following interview of Doctor Clark.

Lines 24 and 25: Affidavits of C. O. Beardsley, M. D., are correct and stand for what they say.

Lines 26, 27, and 28: You are making a broad statement, which is fully answered in the body of this letter and former affidavits.

Lines 29, 30, and 31: Read letter of June 22, 1926, page 9. The paragraph referred to was a prophecy, and from the facts presented you should have made a diagnosis, in all of which you failed, and makes it necessary to upset your decision by additional evidence and by assistance of your medical director, Doctor Black, unknowingly.

Lines 38 and 39: No bacteria report of pneumococcus was found.

Lines 40, 41, and 42: Laboratory finding of hemolytic streptococcus by microscope is impossible (see Doctor Black's statement) and should have no value as evidence. We all admit Rothman died, and was a soldier, but deny that streptococcus infection can be called pneumonia. Staphylococcus not classified. Absence of pneumococcus eliminates pneumonia. Laboratory microscopical report wipes out laboratory diagnosis by Doctor Black. The sources of streptococcus hemolyticus are many.

Lines 42, 43, and 44: Hemolytic streptococcus is virulent; no more so than tubercular bacteria. I can not agree with you that hemolytic streptococci caused more deaths in 1918 than any other cause. Lieut. Col. Arthur Dare, Medical Corps, United States Army, Chief Medical Service, United States General Hospital No. 14, Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., report of cases of pneumonia associated with pneumococci in combination with streptococcus hemolyticus, 423 cases, 29 deaths, mortality 6.3 per cent.

Lines 45, 46, and 47: Doctor Clark's picture of veteran's condition is anything but a classical description. See his record of case and compare with hospital record.

Lines 49 and 50: Terrific hemorrhage. See nurse's statement and hospital record. A solid engorgement of lungs as in pneumonia does not produce a bright-red hemorrhage; blood is dark, expectorations in small quantities, sputum is tenacious and difficult to expectorate; in pneumonia this is known as prune-juice sputum.

Lines 51 and 52: Hospital record is dependable; that expectoration of bright red blood occurred and quite freely, a positive indication of tuberculosis.

Lines 61, 62, 63, and 64: Is correct and reaffirmed.

Lines 64, 65, and 66: The investigation was very elementary and fails to read truthfully.

Lines 67, 68, and 69: Do you require a falsehood to satisfy your imagination? No sputum examination was made to find tubercular bacteria to determine disease. A good clinical examination was made and was believed sufficient.

Lines 71 to 77, inclusive: Doctor Clark called 20 hours before death; did not know Veteran Rothman before; diagnosed case, put him in his automobile, and took him to Mercy Hospital in less than one hour. (See B. L. Griffith's affidavit and Doctor Clark's letter attached, calling it pneumonia.) Your Doctor Black would laugh at laboratory findings as a determined examination for pneumonia.

Lines 78, 79, and 80: Death certificates may say anything to pass the requirements.

Lines 81 and 82: Show a wonderful lapse of memory and no record.

Lines 84 and 89, inclusive: A perusal of all evidence presented to date by you does not agree with findings from any source and does not fit into history of Rothman; affidavits, hospital record, clinical examination, duration of sickness, or laboratory microscopical findings, but does agree with lines 15, 16, and 17 of your letter of September 9, 1926.

Please review my letter of June 22, 1926, in connection with this as a matter of evidence.

C. O. BEARDSLEY, M. D.

OTTAWA, OHIO, November 13, 1926.

Hon. F. T. HINES,

Director United States Veterans' Bureau, Washington, D. C.

Reply to F. A. B. A., September 9, 1926. Julius C. Rothman, deceased. C-641456.

CONTENTIONS AND DISCUSSION

I accept your interpretation of the advisory group in a gracious spirit, and grant you sympathy and charity in your analysis of my contentions in a letter of June 22, 1926.

This case of Julius C. Rothman was brought to your attention by my affidavits, his hospital record, and death certificate, the latter made by Dr. D. J. Clark, as prima facie evidence.

A death certificate may say anything that the physician may write in it, whether it is imaginary or a fact, just sufficient to pass the vital-statistics censor, as in this case, and should have no weight in the determination.

In the third paragraph of your letter, lines 15, 16, and 17, you make an admission that "the evidence introduced to support the contention that the cause of death was pulmonary tuberculosis consists of affidavits by laymen, by Doctor Clark, and myself." Thanks for this kind admission, and by this admission you have lost the foundation upon which you base all objections. Having been driven to quarters by my letter, the adoption of a panacea (or passing the buck) to a streptococcus hemolytic and a staphylococcus as the cause of death, totally ignoring the pneumococcus and piffers bacillus. What an absurd proof of pneumonia, especially pleural pneumonia. The pneumococcus must be held responsible for the causation of most cases of both lobar and lobular pneumonia, but not for a number of other pathologic processes and conditions. Among the most common of these are inflammations of the pleura, pericardium, endocardium, and meninges, as will be pointed out.

Both streptococci and staphylococci are capable by themselves of provoking pneumonic processes of the lobular type, and when found with the pneumococcus they may be regarded as taking some part in producing the observed pathogenic effect.

The history of streptococcus infection was studied at Camp Custer by Blanton, Burhans, and Hunter, and published in the Journal American Medical Association, May 24, 1919, 72, No. 21, page 1520. The streptococci manifested themselves uniformly as secondary invaders in mixed infection, and as secondary infectors more often than any other microbe. The streptococci have a baneful influence upon a number of maladies, notably upon the last stage of pulmonary tuberculosis, in which they involve healthy tissues adjacent to tuberculosis area, and predisposed to hemorrhages. The staphylococcus is found in suppurative inflammations of all parts of the human body, as well as the streptococcus.

It has been demonstrated that the streptococci are not of uncommon finding in the tonsils and teeth of apparently healthy individuals, as well as those suffering from systemic infections and toxemias. It is important to determine whether the acute respiratory infections

are the result of infection from the patient's own organism, or by a more virulent strain from some other individual. This problem is thoroughly covered by Davis, Journal American Medical Association, February 1, 1919, 72, No. 5, page 320, who considers it reasonable that individuals are being infected from time to time with their own streptococci, especially following the infectious diseases, and by this process the streptococcus becomes more and more virulent and aggressive, reaching a point ultimately at which the small dose contained in infected droplets, or other vehicles, are sufficient to transmit the disease to a normal person. The relation of streptococcus hemolyticus has been studied by Blake, who believes that the widespread streptococcus infections have been due to invasions of virulent streptococci in individuals rendered susceptible by predisposing diseases, either direct or indirect, and that autogenous infection had played its rôle in the production of these streptococcus infections. In addition to their conspicuous rôle as initiators of very diverse pathologic conditions. Streptococci are present in mixed infections and secondary infections more often than any other microbe; that is to say, they have a tendency to follow in the wake of, and act as accomplices to other pathologic organisms. From the foregoing information you have learned that the streptococcus hemolyticus is virulent all within itself, and does not require a background of any special disease to assist it in its destructive nature against life, as it is destructive within itself.

In diseases which weaken the resistance due to the primary specific infections agents are followed by the invasion of the tissues by streptococci. The streptococcus invasion of the lung tissue is common in pulmonary tuberculosis as a secondary infection.

Postoperative hemolytic streptococcus wound infections and their relation to hemolytic streptococcus carriers among the operating personnel. F. L. Melency and F. A. Stevens, New York, found upon examination of the operating-room staff the fact that 33 per cent of these persons harbored hemolytic streptococcus in their throats and one of the instrument nurses carried it in her nose. The evidence was very strong that one case of postoperative hemolytic streptococcus wound infection was caused by transfer of the organism from nose of nurse to the wound at the time of operation. (Journal American Medical Association, p. 1591, November 6, 1926.)

The syndromes of all chronic diseases are made unrecognizable by acute infections from any bacterial source, simulating one disease with another. Such is true of chronic tuberculosis infected by piffers bacilli, makes the symptoms complex, likewise when infected by pneumococcus, which is remarkably frequent, the case becomes concomitant or secondary pneumonic infection. In like manner any bacterial infection becomes a secondary infection to the original and more particular to a chronic condition.

Experiences are not limited to those I have mentioned, but others from Pasteur, 1878, Héricourt and Richets in 1888, Marmoreke in 1895, Van Develbe in 1896, on through Weaver and Tunncliffe in 1911 to Dick in 1925. I wish to quote from your medical director, Dr. B. W. Black, in answer to the following questions:

First. What do you understand by a pathological report as follows: Sputum-microscopical examination shows hemolytic streptococcus and staphylococcus?

Answer. You are advised that the hemolytic streptococcus and staphylococcus can not be classified by microscopical examination alone. It is necessary to resort to these cultural examinations before one may definitely classify the organism as hemolytic streptococcus. With regard to the staphylococcus it is the desire to inform you that this organism must also be classified by cultural means. (Then the Mercy Hospital technician at Toledo, Ohio, in his laboratory report, has made a statement which he can not sustain by his microscopic examination of this case.)

Second. Will you name the disease contributing to the above?

Answer. Desire to inform you that hemolytic streptococci and staphylococci may be found in the normal sputa, and their presence does not necessarily imply disease.

Third. Give me etiology and prognosis on first question.

Answer. You are advised that it is impossible to give etiology and prognosis unless a disease entity is first established. (No disease entity being established by the hospital laboratory in this case, and normal sputa could contain the bacteria as found. Therefore, the pathological microscopical examination of sputa was of no value in this case.)

Fourth. Do you think a positive determination can be made by the pathology of the first question?

Answer. The last question is not clear. (True, it is impossible to give etiology and prognosis unless a disease entity is first established, which is not scientifically done in this case by neglecting to cultivate the sputa upon blood-agar plate and definitely determine the bacteria of entity, thereby determining the disease by bacterial finding, which was not done in this case.)

TOLEDO, OHIO, November 11, 1926.

C. O. BEARDSLEY, M. D., Ottawa, Ohio.

DEAR DOCTOR: Pardon the delay. It is possible to have hemolytic streptococcus in the sputum without any disease. Then again you may

find it in grippe, sore throat, and in hemolytic streptococcus pneumonia. You could not determine this by microscopic examination alone, however, but it is necessary to culture it on blood media.

Hoping this answers your question, I am,

Yours very truly,

H. J. BOLLINGER,

216½ Michigan Street, Toledo, Ohio.

The above is the pathologist of the Mercy Hospital, Toledo, Ohio, and the individual who made the microscopical findings of streptococcus hemolyticus and staphylococcus in the sputum of Julius C. Rothman, and who gave it as his final conclusion that it was a case of pneumonia.

And on the date of this letter, November 11, 1926, has made a written statement, as given above, contradicting his first statement, by saying it could not be found by microscope, thus invalidating his evidence as given to be worthless.

And the death certificate made by Doctor Clark was only a matter of a guess, and if depending upon this pathological examination, which is a contradiction, and the mixture of a guess and a contradiction does not make a fact, and both are worthless as evidence.

I wish to thank Dr. B. W. Black for his courtesy and compliment him upon his learning and ask that he review the hospital record and laboratory report of Julius C. Rothman, and make practical use of his answers.

Dr. H. J. Bollinger, pathologist of Mercy Hospital, Toledo, Ohio, statement attached. The pathologist who made laboratory report of Julius C. Rothman's condition says that hemolytic streptococcus is found in sputum without disease and can not be determined by microscopical examination, which contradicts the laboratory report in every particular. This report has no value in this case as a solution of condition present at any time during the life of patient or afterwards, and should not have any weight in this or any other case.

You can find the streptococcus hemolytic located in the tonsils, teeth, otitis media, suppurative meningitis, suppurative pelvic peritonitis, erysipelas, puerperal fever, scarlet fever, smallpox, diphtheria, bronchial pneumonia, lobar pneumonia, as well as in tuberculosis and an endless number of other diseases.

It is necessary to make a culture of sputa on blood-agar plates to classify the streptococcus, also the staphylococcus. The streptococci are spherical but differ from those of the latter organism in being usually united in long or short chains; under certain conditions are aggregated in heaps or masses. The microscope can detect the streptococci after staining. The streptococci are not motile, do not possess flagella and do not form spores. The hemolytic streptococci are characterized by a sharp clear zone around a colony, after cultivating, known as lacking. From the Mercy Hospital report you passed to a final conclusion that Julius C. Rothman's condition (lines 73 and 74 of your letter of September 9, 1926) was correctly diagnosed as a virulent pleural pneumonia with the additional infection of streptococcus hemolyticus microscopically found. (Proven impossible by Doctor Black.)

You offer no evidence of any pneumococcus or piffers bacteria as being present at any time, and only from the death certificate have you any evidence of pneumonia, and this may be as much a blunder as the laboratory findings of hemolytic streptococcus with a microscope. Further, in this case of Julius C. Rothman there is no telling the source of the sputum examined, from what patient, person, or nurse the sputum, urine, stool, or suppuration this specimen originated, as any person in the presence of Julius C. Rothman could be a carrier and would communicate the streptococcus by coughing, sneezing, speaking, whispering, crying, forced breathing, or from foodstuff or dishes, etc., as mentioned in last paragraph on page 2 of this letter. Not only these, but the injection of antipneumococcus serum (which contains pneumococcus, streptococcus, staphylococcus bacillus as a polyvalent vaccine), which was given Julius C. Rothman hypodermically as principal treatment without typing the pneumococci is a flagrant blunder and proof of lack of knowledge of this case at hand.

Tangemeister, in his experiments with antistreptococcus serum, believes the serum acts specifically, but that it is not antitoxic, but increases the number of streptococcus by destroying the immune bodies, allowing the streptococcus to become very virulent.

Serum treatment was used in this case. (See hospital record.)

Cole and his fellow workers at the Rockefeller Institute: No effective serum of pneumococci II-III-IV type has been obtained to date. Before the serum can be used in treatment of patient the type of infecting organism must be determined (which was not done in Rothman's case; no pneumococci found or typing made). Antipneumococci serum is not antitoxic (Sherman's Manual of Vaccine Therapy). In the use of antipneumococci serum in this case without the above knowledge caused more alarming conditions and possibly a fatality.

The injection of serum of an animal into an animal of a different species is always followed by the appearance of a hemolyzing substance. This substance is specific, that is, it dissolves the hemoglobin out of the red corpuscles of the species from which the injected

blood was derived, and is without action upon the corpuscles of other animals. The guinea pig inoculated with rabbit's blood becomes hemolytic for red corpuscles of the rabbit. (Ehrlich.)

With all of these opportunities of secondary infection of an already diseased and debilitated body, a death would be no surprise.

I am not a stranger to the fact that the streptococcus infection of the lungs causes an inflammatory congestion, and carries many of the symptoms of a pneumonia, but its provings are not of pneumonic origin. The streptococcus needs no assistance to be virulent. Line 77 of your letter of September 9, 1926: "And he spent the next 20 hours as a typical pneumonia case," and no report of pneumococcus being found. This looks like trying to ride two horses at the same time and each going in opposite directions. Line 49 to line 60 of your letter of September 9, 1926, does not dispute the nurse's affidavit, but more strongly confirms her statement of a terrific hemorrhage and the expectorating of bright red blood. Lines 19, 20, and 21 of your letter of September 9, 1926, says, "Doctor Clark first visited the veteran; he found him apparently in an alarming condition, with high temperature and cyanosis." Would you believe a cyanosized patient whose blood is loaded with carbonic-acid gas as in cyanosis due to congestion of lungs could expectorate a bright red blood? No; not in this day of thinking.

The nurse was a constant attendant and made frequent notations of facts unprejudiced by anyone.

Line 68 of your letter of September 9, 1926, to determine requires a sputum examination and a finding of cocci and their identification before a positive diagnosis is made and the name of the disease can be determined, which was not done in this case for either la grippe, pneumonia, or tuberculosis.

Not to be impartial and having no personal interest for more than what is right and consistent I am constrained to accept the evidence of laymen in preference to the diagnosis which you report as a matter of record. This looks a good deal like a Bible story. When Jacob's mother deceived his father by stripping gloves made of kid skin over Jacob's arms. Jacob went to his father and received his blessing, which was meant for his brother Esau. And when the error was found out his father said it was too late to change the record, as it had been so recorded in Heaven.

Individually, I am glad that I live in the United States of America, and proud am I of her flag, form of government, and people, and in the language of Abraham Lincoln, in 1861, to the slave States, "You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the constitutional rights of man, while I have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend."

Lines 27 and 28 of your letter of September 9, 1926. My affidavits stand for what they say. Read them. You have made an effort to bolster up your side of the case by sending out a representative who is well known by some of our townsmen, who were associated with him in a training camp in Alabama, to admit of comment. To bolster up means trust no person but form an opinion through a channel of least resistance; just pass the buck. The soldier may die soon; then all will be ended.

Lines 42-45 of your letter of September 9, 1926: I admit the virulence of the streptococcus hemolyticus as a secondary infection, as found in the laboratory record, but which will not allow you to call it pneumonia in the absence of pneumococcus. The streptococcus hemolyticus are classified after the 24 hours' incubation. The colonies are marked by being encircled by a clear area where the corpuscles have laked and the hemoglobin has been appropriated. The extent of this lake area can not be considered as of value in relation to a qualitative determination.

The pneumococcus are surrounded by an opaque area, and upon examination may show a greater abundance of pneumococcus than streptococcus.

Medical history fails to report all cases as dying of streptococci infection, but a large per cent (45) do die.

Pneumococci are found in the blood within six hours after introduction, and empyema, pericarditis, and other complications may follow rapidly. In any given instance it may be impossible to determine the precise sequence of events. The exact determination of virulence of a bacterial strain is limited by the fact that virulence for one species does not necessarily correspond with the virulence for another, as in pneumonia, in which four types have been made. In type 1 the mortality is 25 per cent. Type 2, 32 per cent. Type 3, 45 per cent. Type 4, 16 per cent. Within these classifications no soluble toxin secreted by the cell during life has yet been demonstrated, but by the disintegration of the cell body, however, by freezing and grinding, by the action of bile salts, or by autolysis yields a solution possessing hemolytic and actual toxic properties, but little is known of the toxic substance. The agglutinative reaction has been of practical value in identifying the types of pneumococci. No excuse should be offered for passing the buck in negligence of a laboratory technician in not finding and reporting the presence of pneumococci in this case, as it is well known that 95 per cent of cases of pneumonia are due to pneumococci. It was not found and therefore could not be reported

as a fact in the case of Julius Charles Rothman; all of which would cause a bacteriologist to doubt the entire laboratory diagnosis as reported in this case.

In line 34 of your letter of September 9, 1926, you call me to account for using "plura," a stenographic error in spelling "pleura." Why should I not speak of this form when you accept the death certificate as evidence, and it is not supported by laboratory report from Mercy Hospital, at Toledo, Ohio, as to finding any pneumococci or an effusion in the pleural cavity, and above all the failure to report and lanceonating pain with every breath in the nurse's hospital record.

Line 49 of your letter of September 9, 1926, read: Nurse's report of frequent spitting of bright red blood and a terrific hemorrhage; the medical profession know this to be hemoptysis.

In pneumonia the lungs become solid, due to an inflammatory engorgement, and at autopsies, we find the lung tissues cut like liver. The hemorrhage from solid congested lungs is not rapid or excessive, the blood being squeezed or osmosed into bronchial tubes, carried to throat by cilia, causing a cough and expectoration of tenacious sputum stained with blood. These hemorrhages in pneumonia are known as red hepatization, the blood is dark and in small quantities. Hemorrhage in la grippe is nearly always nasal or epistaxis.

In line 20 of your letter of September 9, 1926: Pulse rate, as reported by Doctor Clark a short time before entering the hospital with Julius C. Rothman, was 140, temperature 104. See nurse's first record at 9.45 a. m., pulse 124, after an automobile ride and some walking. It is more than likely that Doctor Clark misread his thermometer, as the nurse's next temperature report was still below the Doctor's.

Line 81 and 82 of your letter of September 9, 1926, shows a lapse of memory in the doctor, and more than likely no clinical record was kept.

Line 67 and 68 of your letter of September 9, 1926: To make a determining examination the micrococcus organism must be found, which was not done by the Mercy Hospital technician, so a determining diagnosis of the case of Julius C. Rothman was not made.

Lines 73 and 74 of your letter of September 9, 1926: In trying to introduce a virulent type of pneumonia without findings, with the additional infection of streptococcus hemolyticus and staphylococcus, why not call it tuberculosis with the additional infection of streptococcus hemolyticus and staphylococcus, or again call it a virulent streptococcus hemolyticus and staphylococcus infection?

Line 85 of your letter of September 9, 1926: It is impossible to overcome all of the foregoing, for the want of definite evidence to determine is wanting, in all evidence produced to date.

The duration of la grippe with pleural pneumonia is 7 to 16 days, a much longer period than that of streptococcus hemolytic before a crisis occurs, while that of tuberculosis is from a few months to years.

The Journal of the American Medical Association 74, No. 9, February 28, page 1920: "In influenza complications, Small and Stangl studied the first series of the bacteria; influenza was recovered in 100 per cent, pneumococcus in 72.7 per cent, and hemolytic streptococcus in 9.1 per cent."

Lines 29, 30, 31 of your letter of September 9, 1926: Please read this paragraph again and see if it is not a prophecy and not an assumption by leaving the subject discussed to your good judgment.

Lines 61 to 66, inclusive, of your letter of September 9, 1926: From the foregoing evidence I still maintain from my clinical examination that Veteran Julius C. Rothman died of pulmonary tuberculosis contracted in the service, that he died at the Mercy Hospital, in Toledo, Ohio, 1 year and 10 days after the date of his discharge, January 17, 1920.

It is admitted from a standpoint of clinical medicine that the most important microscopic object for which search is made is the tuberculosis bacillus, which has an acid-fast property requiring special stain technic, which is regularly employed and no errors occur. The bacillus of influenza is usually in great number in the nasal secretions of true influenza and easily identified, but not found in ordinary short attacks of prostration accompanied by coriza.

Line 18 of your letter of September 9, 1926, says a Doctor Miller treated Julius C. Rothman prior to Doctor Clark; for how long and for what is not stated. Thanks. See Doctor Miller's letter attached denying the same; also see B. L. Griffith's affidavit, attached, on interview of Doctor Miller.

I have given considerable space to the pneumonia and additional infections side of this case and have pointed out many points for consideration which will not bear investigation, as well as many fallacies and poor medical knowledge, which makes this case look more like fiction than scientific truths. I will conclude this discussion by reviewing the evidence that favors the diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis.

Tuberculosis is not a spontaneous disease, but exists for a considerable period of time. As in this case, its activity and effect was being demonstrated long before the first week in October, 1919, when I made my clinical examination. In many cases it exists in a latent state before characteristic local or constitutional symptoms appear which may develop suddenly and proceed to an early termination, as in this case, an infection of streptococci may have hastened death.

An inherited form of tuberculosis develops in early childhood. In this case it developed soon after being discharged from the service. It was not acquired for compensation, not for the fun of having a disease, as no compensation was asked for during his life, and playing with the tools of death was not his ambition.

His temperature in October, 1919, was a marked symptom. (See my affidavit.) High temperatures are due to the action of some toxins on the nervous centers formed by bacilli. In this case I believe the tubercular bacilli had a firm hold on him from my clinical examination, but was not determined by sputum examination. Pain in chest, not lancinating, a marked symptom, upon coughing. Of this he had plenty. As tuberculosis advances all signs and symptoms of constitutional impairment become evident. (Review my affidavits.)

Read the affidavit of Mrs. Tompkins, landlady of the hotel in which he resided before and after the war. Read the affidavit of the hotel clerk.

His emaciation was profound, heart action accelerated, respiration increased, accompanied with dyspnoea and cyanosis; stomach often intolerant of food, as in this case; late stage insomnia, loss of mental power, and often delirium appears before death unless some intercurrent complication takes hold, as in this case, additional infection of streptococcus hemolyticus is claimed by the laboratory report, and hastens the fatal termination. Pirexia is usually marked in the last stage, 105° to 106° often reached. Pulse 120 to 140. Respiration very rapid, as a rule, between 30 to 60 per minute. Cough is permanent, as in this case, when I examined him, and recognized by laymen, coworkers, and hotel people. (Read their affidavits.) Hemoptyses occasionally and of bright red blood. (Read nurse's affidavit and hospital record.) Only when the meninges are involved do we expect delirium. My clinical examination was made over three months before death of Julius C. Rothman. La grippe and pneumonia do not last this long, but tuberculosis will last much longer than three months, even years.

I purposely wish to introduce here the subject, staphylococcus, for reasons you will see—that staphylococcus infections are not uncommon after serious diseases and more frequently found in those afflicted with chronic processes. There is an infection whose predisposing influence predominates all others. I refer to tuberculosis. The lesions caused by it are often overlooked during life, but are found at autopsies and given as a cause of death staphylococcus infection. The pulmonary symptoms and cachexia have been attributed to the staphylococcus alone, until after an autopsy and tuberculosis evidence produced.

No autopsy of Julius C. Rothman was made, even after his short sojourn of 20 hours in Mercy Hospital, where all the opportunities and privileges were at hand, not even a possible objector present, to learn the exact cause of death. I can imagine I hear the M. D. at the hospital say, "He is dead and an autopsy will do him no good, so we will pass the buck." Many doctors have treated patients for a supposed disease and later, often too late, waken up to the fact that they were wrong. I protest against the tendency of attaching undue importance to laboratory examinations, which result in weakening of clinical acumen. Too many laboratories furnish systematically positive or suspected reactions because they think that an interpretation will be more agreeable to the physician.

I am not an enemy of scientific progress, merely desire the continuance of clinical methods of examination to show a little self-knowledge and not depend upon the roentgenologist, chemist, microbiologist, and the pathologic anatomist to furnish a ready-made diagnosis. I believe in consulting the scientific collaborators upon doubtful diagnosis or confirm a grave decision, but the information must fit into a thorough clinical examination or it has no value.

While a great many laboratories do reliable work, many do not, due to incompetent personnel and poor equipment. The public has come to rely on a diagnosis based on laboratory examination, but of late their errors are attracting attention.

Lines 10, 11, 12, and 13 of your letter of September 9, 1926: This veteran was discharged from service January 7, 1919, registered at his hotel, Thompkins, Toledo, Ohio, January 8, 1919; he died January 17, 1920, having been in the hospital only about 20 hours. During all this time he never presented any claim for disability benefits. If you could hear the soldiers talk, you would never allow these words to pass your lips or pen them against a veteran dead or alive. He has too often been insulted by being accused of being a gold bricker by the examiners, and he thinks what are his losses is the Government's gain, which increases the funds to support the regiments of people connected with this department regardless of quality, that a few favored veterans may receive a pittance.

I will answer lines 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the words of his foster mother:

First. That Julius C. Rothman was afraid to ask for compensation for fear of exposing his condition unnecessarily, lest he be discharged by his employer, and as a bread winner be compelled to ask alms or go to the poorhouse.

Second. The time lost in establishing his case would be indefinite, and charity or death would come to him first, or before he could run the line of red tape to satisfy all.

Third, His inability to carry his life insurance should be corroborative evidence enough to satisfy the Government of his poverty.

I must admit that the foregoing answers are too practical to be denied.

In conclusion, permit me to ask a question which I look to be advertised in capital letters all over this land: How many United States Army war veterans are living in almshouses, upon the charity of relatives, and confined in prisons for stealing in preference to starving, feeble-minded homes, and institutions, all due to unnecessary passing the buck and accepting fiction for facts.

I have written this letter to the Veterans' Bureau and to no particular individual, as it may seem in using the pronoun "you."

C. O. BEARDSLEY, M. D.

INSURING DEPOSITORS IN BANKS

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by having the bill which I introduced on the first day of this session of Congress—H. R. 14921—printed in the RECORD. This is a bill for the purpose of insuring depositors in member banks of the Federal reserve system against loss.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a bill in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert the following:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, December 11, 1926.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

A Bill (H. R. 14921) to amend section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, for the purpose of insuring depositors in member banks of the Federal reserve system against loss.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Federal reserve act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) That for the purpose of insuring depositors in banks of the Federal reserve system against loss through bank failures there is hereby established in the Treasury a special fund to be known as the depositors' guaranty fund and to be available for direct expenditure by the Federal Reserve Board as provided in subdivisions (e), (f), and (h).

"(b) For the purpose of establishing the depositors' guaranty fund there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not in excess of \$50,000,000. Such sum when appropriated shall be advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury to such fund. Thereafter such Secretary shall advance to such fund, from time to time and within the appropriations therefor, amounts sufficient to maintain such fund at not below \$25,000,000.

"(c) After all necessary expenses of a Federal reserve bank have been paid or provided for the stockholders shall be entitled to receive an annual dividend of 6 per cent on the paid-in capital stock, which dividend shall be cumulative. After the aforesaid dividend claims have been fully met the net earnings shall be paid into the depositors' guaranty fund, except that (1) the whole of such net earnings shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 100 per cent of the subscribed capital stock of such bank, and thereafter 10 per cent of such net earnings shall be paid into such surplus fund, and (2) any such net earnings in excess of amounts necessary to maintain the depositors' guaranty fund at \$75,000,000, and to establish and maintain such surplus fund, shall be paid to the United States as a franchise tax.

"(d) Any money paid to the United States under subdivision (c) as a franchise tax shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be used to supplement the gold reserve held against outstanding United States notes, or applied to the reduction of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by such Secretary.

"(e) Whenever a member bank of the Federal reserve system (except a bank the depositors of which are entitled to the benefits of a State law providing for a financial plan to insure bank depositors against loss) is dissolved or placed in the hands of a receiver or liquidating agent, the Federal Reserve Board shall estimate, as soon as is practicable, whether the assets of such bank, together with such amounts as may be realized by enforcing the liabilities of the shareholders, officers, and directors thereof, will be sufficient to discharge such bank's obligations to depositors. Upon the basis of such estimate, the board shall make payments to such depositors, from the depositors' guaranty fund, of amounts which, in the opinion of the board, will not be realized for the benefit of such depositors from such sources. When depositors' claims not satisfied by payments from the depositors' guaranty fund have been paid, such fund shall be entitled to reimbursement, for payments made under authority of this subdivision, from any assets of such bank (including amounts realized by enforcing the liabilities of shareholders, officers, and directors), having,

among the creditors of such bank, the same order of preference the depositors would have had if they had received no payments from such fund.

"(f) If upon final settlement of the affairs of any such bank the assets, together with such amounts as may be realized by enforcing the liabilities of the shareholders, officers, and directors thereof and amounts paid from the depositors' guaranty fund under subdivision (e), are insufficient to discharge such bank's obligations to depositors, the Federal Reserve Board shall pay to such depositors from the depositors' guaranty fund such amounts as may be necessary to make up the deficiency.

"(g) All payments from the depositors' guaranty fund shall be made upon proof satisfactory to the Federal Reserve Board, under such regulations as it may prescribe.

"(h) The Federal Reserve Board, in administering the provisions of this section, is authorized (1) to make such regulations as are necessary to execute the functions vested in it thereby, and (2) to make such expenditures from the depositors' guaranty fund (including expenditures for personal service at the seat of the government and elsewhere) as may be necessary efficiently to execute such functions.

"(i) Should a Federal reserve bank be dissolved or go into liquidation, any surplus remaining, after the payment of all debts, dividend requirements as hereinbefore provided, and the par value of the stock, shall be paid into the depositors' guaranty fund.

"(j) Federal reserve banks, including the capital stock and surplus therein and the income derived therefrom, shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation, except taxes upon real estate."

FARM RELIEF

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short article on farm relief by a prominent citizen of my State.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on farm relief. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield? Is this a newspaper article?

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. It is by a farmer of my State and also published in my home paper.

Mr. TILSON. But it is from a newspaper?

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Yes, sir; in my county, by an outstanding farmer discussing farm relief and is a very brief article.

Mr. TILSON. It has not been a recent practice of the House, as I recall, to permit extended newspaper articles, editorials, and so forth, to go in the RECORD.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. It is not an editorial, but by a prominent farmer discussing farm relief, and as it is very short I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article on farm relief:

FARM RELIEF

THE HENRY COUNTY DEMOCRAT:

Hot air furiously spouting from political and quite a few other blow-holes, as to the method and means for this relief, and generally the spouts are at random or wide of the mark.

If farmers could shed old party prejudice and immunize themselves against propaganda, they could get together and rout the negroes from their woodpile.

We howl about local taxes and freight rates. Why? When it is a mere drop in the bucket compared with our indirect tax that is collected on every pound and bushel we sell and every item whatsoever that we buy.

There is a 30 per cent tariff on iron and steel. Railroads use immense amounts of it, and they must get the high cost of material out of freight rates or else go out of business. Farmers also use great quantities of iron and steel in implements, fencing, and roofing, and its price is almost prohibitive under present farm incomes. Hence farm buildings and fences are fast going to rack and ruin and merchants lose the sale and profits on these commodities.

It is not so much the low price of what we sell as it is the high price of what we buy that is responsible for bankruptcy and trustee sales.

It is beyond me how farmers can be hoodwinked by a 42-cent tariff on wheat when they must sell at the European price, less freights and commissions.

Not one farmer out of a hundred seems to realize why steel and other protected industries are piling up billions while agriculture is going bankrupt; that the big interests are seating their tools in Congress by the use of astounding sums of money. Nor that the Coolidge Cabinet is made up of millionaires and multimillionaires. That the proposed pro rata rebate of covered income would amount to stupendous sums

for the big wigs who do not need it. A few dollars or cents to ordinary mortals and not a cent to one farmer in a thousand.

When the farmer goes down financially, soon or later all other business is sure to suffer. You think it out.

ILA. J. MARSH.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message in writing from the President of the United States was presented to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President did on the following dates approve bills of the following titles:

On December 11, 1926:

H. R. 9039. An act to amend section 8 of the act approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stats. p. 961), entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers";

H. R. 10547. An act to require the filing of an affidavit by certain officers of the United States;

H. R. 10739. An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office; and

H. R. 8128. An act to punish counterfeiting, altering, or uttering of Government transportation requests.

On December 14, 1926:

H. R. 6466. An act for the relief of Edward C. Roser.

On December 15, 1926:

H. R. 11119. An act to alter the personnel of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on matters concerning the Department of State, required by certain provisions of law enumerated in the report.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 15, 1926.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14827.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14827.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14827, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose yesterday there was pending a point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] against certain language contained in the appropriation bill. I have made some further investigation of that subject, including the merits of the question involved, which I have discussed with Mr. Smith, the general manager of the Alaskan Railroad, and he has urged very strongly the necessity of the language. I also studied the statute to which I hurriedly called the attention of the Chair yesterday, and especially one provision which I urged the authority given to make contracts with other carriers. On further consideration it appears quite possible that that language has reference to a division of charges, and so forth, rather than to the operation of water lines. Therefore I am willing to concede that the point of order is good if it is insisted upon by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The gentleman from Massachusetts referred to conditions in Alaska, and he knows the capacity of the management of the railroad and their good judgment, and instead of opposing the point of order, which of course I concede, I shall be glad to appeal to the gentleman from Massachusetts to with-

draw his opposition to the language and withdraw his point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I did not make the point of order yesterday for the purpose of in any way obstructing the well-being or management of the Alaskan Railroad. It seemed to me that the language as suggested by the committee was very much broader than should have been written to comply with the general rules of legislative procedure. While I objected to the appropriation, which seemed to me beyond what the Alaskan situation demands, and have found a good deal of fault at times with the manner in which governmental affairs are conducted in Alaska, I never have criticized the management of the Alaskan Railroad. On the contrary, I consider that the general manager, Mr. Noel W. Smith, is a most practical railroad man, dealing with a very difficult and discouraging problem, and doing it in a most excellent manner.

I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that we are going, in the phraseology to which I called the attention of the Chair yesterday, beyond the right that we ought to exercise here of now amending the Alaskan Railroad act in order to establish a steamship line. It was on that account that I made the point of order.

I have read the Alaskan Railroad act carefully since the point of order was raised yesterday. That act was approved March 12, 1914; it has to do with the construction of the railroad, not with its operation years after construction. If it is a matter of insistence upon proper parliamentary procedure, I would ask the Chair to rule favorably upon the item to which I called his attention. I realize, however, that in the hands of Mr. Smith such authority as the language of the bill undertakes to give him would not be abused, but would be used for the purpose of further extending transportation facilities in Alaska, which are greatly needed. With the distinct understanding—as of course we all know that no appropriation carries with it more than one year's authority—not withdrawing the right at any future time to renew such a point of order if the language is again used in an appropriation bill, or that any precedent for the future is being established, and in view of the desire of Mr. Smith to use this authority probably for a very brief period of time and while he is himself manager of the Alaskan Railroad, I will yield to the desire of the committee and withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit me to speak just a moment, I should like to express my appreciation of the very kindly cooperation of the gentleman from Massachusetts in acceding to our request.

The CHAIRMAN. The situation is this. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order. The chairman of the committee concedes the point of order. The gentleman from Massachusetts then, after remarks, withdraws the point of order, which the chairman of the committee has conceded. In order that the Record may be clear and that the attitude of the present occupant of the chair be fully understood, let it be stated that the present occupant of the chair is ready to rule on the point of order; but if no one insists upon it, the Clerk will read.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to supplement what the chairman of the subcommittee has said for a moment and say that this provision in the bill is very important to the development of Alaska. We might as well have it in the law that they may not build docks or make further connections with a provision of this kind. In the hands of this man Smith, one of the great railroad men of the world, it will be tremendously efficient. If this item went out, there ought to be immediate legislation extending this power. I join with the gentleman from Michigan in appreciating the action of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLAND. If it is so important, why can it not come from the proper legislative committee?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not join in the expression of the Chair that it is subject to a point of order. I think it is a proper exercise of authority that we have for the development and handling of that railroad. We have as broad an authority as language can give, and I do not think there is anything put in there for the protection of that line of railroad and the protection of the Government's property that this does not strictly conform to.

Mr. BLAND. Does not the gentleman think that as a matter of legislation it ought to come from the proper committee? I make the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order of the gentleman from Virginia comes too late, there having been debate on the paragraph.

Mr. BLAND. There has not been any debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the RECORD will show that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] made a statement after the decision of the Chair and that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] made some debate. That being true, the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia comes too late. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Alaska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTHERLAND: Page 94, line 5, after the word "Provided," strike out "\$1,400,000" and insert "\$1,700,000."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would mean the restoration of the original Budget estimate. Mr. Smith, the superintendent of the railroad, made his plans for the fiscal year 1928 and submitted his estimates, very carefully made, to the Budget. I understand there was a cut there of about \$100,000, and the cut of \$300,000 made by the committee Mr. Smith feels is too much. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], as well as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], have spoken of Mr. Smith and his peculiar ability as a railroad manager. I want to say that he is a sort of an anomaly among the Alaskan Federal employees. He is what is known as a borrowed man. He was borrowed by the Secretary of the Interior from the Pennsylvania Railroad and to-day is a member of that organization. He is a very careful and conservative man and has presented his estimates for the year 1928 in good faith. The chairman of the subcommittee has said that he could come in during the middle of the year with a deficiency estimate, but he can not very well carry through his carefully prepared plans on the proposition of bringing in a deficiency estimate in the middle of the year.

I realize it is asking considerable of the committee to accede to this amendment, they having made the cut; but I feel that their confidence in Mr. Smith and his conservative method of operating that railroad would warrant them in restoring the Budget estimate.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The Budget is the special representative of the President of the United States to protect his administration from improper appropriations. The Budget passes upon whether or not proposals will be in accord with the plans and program of the President. The Budget, as I understand it, has approved the \$300,000 the gentleman is asking for and has said that is in accord with the present plans and financial program. The committee has seen fit to go up against the President's financial plans and program and made a cut of \$300,000. Is that the case?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is the case; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am with the gentleman. I think he ought to have this money.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am asking that the Budget estimate be restored. I do not see much difference in bringing in a deficiency estimate of \$300,000 in the middle of the year and placing that amount in the bill at this time, and I do not see why there should be much controversy over it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] appears to have entirely overlooked what is the fundamental financial program of this administration. The Budget sent to the Congress each year contains the individual items of that program, but the fundamental program is to reduce the expenditures of the Federal Government to the lowest possible figure and no reduction made by the Congress is in opposition to the President's financial program. It always is in entire sympathetic accord with his program.

Now, as to the amendment which has been offered. The item has to do, in the main, with an operating deficit for the Alaska Railroad. Five hundred thousand dollars is for permanent improvements. Two hundred thousand dollars, or more, is for betterments that are practically permanent, but under the Interstate Commerce Commission's rules are not so classified. Seven hundred thousand dollars of the Budget figure was an operating deficit and the committee recommended a reduction of the item by \$300,000, which would leave \$400,000 for the operating deficit. The theory of the committee is this: That an estimate as to an operating deficit is made up, so far as the Budget gets it, almost a year in advance of the opening of the year affected, and almost two years in advance of the close of that fiscal year. The amount of the operating deficit will depend upon the amount of the expenses of operation and the amount of revenues. Both of those figures can not very well be determined exactly in advance. The amount of the oper-

ating expenses can be determined in advance probably more accurately than the amount of the revenues can be determined.

Now, we have to pay the bills incurred by that railroad. We have a management of very high order and of strict integrity, but it seemed to the committee that we should give him \$400,000 of an operating deficit available when the year opens the 1st of July, and then next December, when the year is half over, if he finds that he is not going to be able to get through the year with that amount of money, he can come before Congress and present the situation as it then stands. He can tell better in the middle of the year what the situation is than he can tell a year in advance of the opening of his fiscal year.

I understand that Mr. Smith, the general manager, feels he is restricted and that he must fit his expense program in accordance with that figure, assuming that his revenues are going to be as they are now, but the idea of the committee is that he will carry on his operating expenses as he has planned and in such a way as not to let the railroad deteriorate. He says his present expense program is on that theory and can not be reduced. We do not ask him to reduce that; we simply ask him to take the money and then in the middle of next year, when he knows what the revenues are, he can come in and present his case. The committee, therefore, does not feel that the amendment should be accepted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. Here are the facts, and the gentleman from Michigan will not deny them: Mr. Smith placed his estimates before the Budget and put his cards on the table and said, "Here is my program." The Budget, in effect, said, "You have asked for \$100,000 more than is in accord with the President's financial plan; we are going to cut you down \$100,000." They did cut him down \$100,000, but as to the other estimates which he submitted, they allowed them and they sent them to Congress as being in accord with the President's financial plans and programs. The committee, in effect, stepped in and said, "We do not agree with the President's representative, the Budget," and the committee sliced off another \$300,000.

I am one of those who do not believe in the operation of railroads by the Government. I do not believe the Government ought to be in the railroad business. I do not believe the Government ought to be in any kind of private business. That is my idea, and if I had been here when the proposal was made for the Government to build this railroad in the first place, I would have voted against it; but when the Government has built the railroad and when the Government is attempting to operate it, it ought to operate it on business principles, and no one has said that Mr. Smith is not an expert in the railroad business. No one has said that Mr. Smith does not know what he is talking about when he has asked for this money. No one has said that the Budget has not been qualified to pass upon his requests, when it gives him the \$300,000 which this committee has stepped in and cut off.

This is the situation: Our friend from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has pleased three of his friends. To our friend concerned with the Baker project out in Oregon he has given \$450,000 which the Budget turned down and said was not feasible because the Secretary of the Interior said "If Congress wants to pass it, it will have to assume the responsibility itself." The gentleman pleased another one of his friends by putting in \$400,000 for the Gooding proposition, and then he pleased another friend by putting in \$400,000 for another proposition that was not authorized by the Budget; and to make up for this \$1,250,000 that he has added to the bill which the Budget did not recommend, he was forced to slice the Budget recommendations in some particular to keep within the Budget total. These are the facts. Will the gentleman deny them?

Mr. CRAMTON. What appears to me more clearly is that because the House decided adversely to the gentleman's position on the Baker matter, now the gentleman has to fight the committee all the way along the line.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and the gentleman is backed up by his committee moguls here and that is why it was done.

Mr. CRAMTON. But I will answer the gentleman's question. He is entirely in error.

Mr. BLANTON. In what particular?

Mr. CRAMTON. Absolutely, all the way along.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I submit the bill and the Budget as my proof.

Mr. CRAMTON. As to the Reclamation Service, the total recommended by the committee is \$564,200 below the Budget figures.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not Smith ask for \$100,000 more?

Mr. CRAMTON. And we did not have to go to any other item.

Mr. BLANTON. Wait; let us see if I am right. Did not the Budget cut down Mr. Smith by \$100,000 of the amount he asked?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I do know; they did. And did not the Budget recommend \$300,000, which the gentleman's subcommittee has also cut out of this bill? Did they not do that?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman admits that. Is not Mr. Smith an expert railroad man? The gentleman admits that. He has admitted my facts, because he has nodded his head in assent. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, yes; I admit the gentleman's facts, but not his errors.

Mr. BLANTON. The error is that I got under the gentleman's skin by showing that he put in his bill \$1,250,000 that the Budget had turned down. That is what is hurting the gentleman. [Laughter.]

I was one of those who voted for the Budget. This Government can not be run without a Budget. When we come to a \$4,000,000,000 Congress every year, we must have a Budget. The President of this great Nation can not otherwise keep appropriations within proper bounds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want two minutes more to finish this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes, which gives two minutes to the gentleman from Texas, five minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and I will keep one minute for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes, the time to be consumed as indicated by the gentleman. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, if the President of the United States did not have a Budget to map out his financial program, he could not keep the expenses of this Government within bounds at all. Having a Budget does not interfere with the discretion that we Members of Congress exercise as representatives of the people and holders of the purse strings. We can either vote these Budget recommendations up or down as we please. What I have been inveighing against is for the Committee on Appropriations, into whose exclusive hands we place this power, to come in here and at will override the Budget whenever it wants to, and whenever somebody else wants to do so in some small particular, to bring in their 35 members on the floor here and override Congress.

The Committee on Appropriations knows that when we have these supply bills under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House there are very few Members here comparatively. We rarely ever have more than 100 Members present, and they know that if some Member comes in and tries to override the committee on a proposition, in their places here and there on the floor, both the majority and the minority members of this committee rise in their places and back up the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have another amendment, which I offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 10, after the word "that," strike out the figures "\$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, the \$300,000 cut is taken entirely from the item of maintenance of the road, the upkeep, and operating expenses. The amount for capital expenditures, \$500,000, remains intact. This amendment does not affect the appropriation at all, it simply takes \$100,000 from the item of capital expenditure and places it under operating expenses. That is, two-thirds of the cut under the amendment would be borne in operating expenses and maintenance of way and one-third, or \$100,000, would be borne by capital expenditures. It means a transfer of \$100,000 from one item of expenditure to another.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is the operation of the railroad being hampered in any way?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will be hampered in the operation of the road if this cut of \$300,000 goes through.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman's amendment is to provide \$100,000 for operating expenses.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; if you take it from the capital-expenditure item and place it under the item for operating expenses.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And the only access that people have to this part of the country by passenger or freight is this railroad.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think this matter had better be allowed to stand as it was recommended, that \$500,000 should be set apart for permanent improvement, and if the management desires to present further information at the other end of the Capitol it can do so. The House, of course, will give consideration to anything that comes before it, but, in the light of present information, I do not think it desirable that the amendment should be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Governor, \$10,000; secretary, \$5,400; in all, \$15,400.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, there is considerable misunderstanding among Members as to the method of the Treasury Department in treating certain surplus funds. I believe there is a good deal of confusion in the minds of Members as to how they are treated. I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury asking him directly how he would apply a surplus fund in the Treasury not needed for current expenses of the Government, and if that would be applicable to the reduction of the debt. I will put in the RECORD my letter and his reply, and I am glad to announce that on the 15th day of December, to-day, \$225,000,000 surplus in the Treasury will be applied to the reduction of the national debt. [Applause.]

The following are the letters referred to:

DECEMBER 13, 1926.

HON. ANDREW W. MELLON,

Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that available surplus in the United States Treasury at the end of the fiscal year automatically is used for the reduction of the national debt. Some of my colleagues are under the impression that the use of surplus funds for that purpose is discretionary with you. I desire to inquire if it is your intent to apply the available surplus which will be on hand June 30, 1927, for the reduction of the national debt or to hold said surplus as a surplus fund pending action of Congress in 1928 on further tax reduction. In other words, is it your purpose to hold the surplus and in the event that Congress should reduce taxes in 1928 to use the then surplus for current expenses?

In as much as I have had many inquiries on the subject, I will greatly appreciate an early reply.

Yours sincerely,

F. H. LA GUARDIA.

THE UNDERSECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, December 14, 1926.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of December 13 to Secretary Mellon referring to the automatic use of the surplus to the reduction of the national debt. The situation works out this way: The Treasury has maturities to meet on the 15th of the month in March, June, September, and December. Normally a part of these maturities have to be refunded. In determining how much refunding is necessary the Treasury considers its cash on hand, its expected receipts for the succeeding quarter, and its expected expenditures for that period, and borrows for refunding purposes only enough to carry it to the next quarterly date. The reason for this is obvious, since it is undesirable for the Treasury to borrow money at 3½ per cent and then to leave it in the banks, where it receives 2 per cent interest. An example of how surplus goes into debt reduction can be seen in to-morrow's operations. On the 15th of December some \$450,000,000 of certificates mature. The Treasury has taken into account its cash, which was Saturday some \$124,000,000, its expected receipts from taxes during the next three months in excess of expenditures, the payments on the foreign debts which come in to-morrow, and has determined that by

selling something over \$200,000,000 of new certificates we can carry on the Government into the month of March. Our actual sales of new certificates will be \$229,000,000 and the certificates redeemed are \$452,000,000, so automatically on the 15th our debt will be reduced about \$225,000,000. The situation is similar to that of a man who owed considerable money to his bank on a 90-day note. As the maturity came around he would use the extra cash he had to reduce his indebtedness and renew the balance.

If the situation should be reversed and it was determined that the expenditures per quarter would exceed the receipts, then the Treasury would have to sell a larger amount of securities than it paid off and the debt would increase. You can see that the whole operation is practically automatic.

Very truly yours,

GARRARD B. WINSTON,
Undersecretary of the Treasury.

Hon. F. H. LaGUARDIA,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital for the Insane from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, civilians in the Quartermaster's service of the Army, persons transferred from the Canal Zone who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, and beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau, including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, \$804,000, including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding \$1,500 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers, for which payments may be made in advance, as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding \$1,500 for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates who are not or who cease to be properly chargeable to Federal maintenance in the institution and in returning them to such places of residence: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1928 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent, upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition by the disbursing agent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the chairman in charge of the bill and the ranking minority member about discussing this item. They indicated they would not be unwilling that I should have some time on this item. Under the circumstances, if my colleagues would permit, I would like to have 20 minutes in which to discuss it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that request and permit me to make a request?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, of which the gentleman from Texas shall have 20 minutes and I 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all

amendments thereto be closed in 25 minutes, 20 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Texas and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Michigan. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me hardly fair to make such an arrangement. We do not know what facts will be brought out by the gentleman from Texas, and to limit debate to five minutes after that and foreclose any Member from taking up any further time seems to me unfair.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman want some time?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman desires five minutes, I would be willing to include him in the request. I am trying to make progress on the bill. The gentleman will understand that in permitting the gentleman from Texas to take 20 minutes we are departing somewhat from the rules.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I know that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am frank to say that I have no desire to enter upon a half day's discussion of St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum.

Mr. BLANTON. I have made a considerable study of this subject.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the gentleman from Texas can sometimes start enough commotion in a speech to cause several Members to make speeches.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object. This is an important proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I shall have to object to the gentleman having 20 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, this is a matter that I have given considerable study to.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman from Texas may have 20 minutes, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then I ask for five minutes after that time. I do not think that I shall use it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request to make it 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan modifies his request to make it 30 minutes, 5 minutes of the time to be consumed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you will notice that of the \$804,000 which is carried in this paragraph, which you are turning over to Dr. William A. White, Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum, to expend, it is provided on page 95, beginning in line 2, that part of it is for the care of "all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau," and others. That does not mean that they are men who have been adjudged insane by due administration of law. That means men whom the Secretary of the Navy says shall be put in an insane asylum for life on his mere signature whenever he gets ready. It means men in the Army whom the Secretary of War says must spend their time in an insane asylum on his order merely, without judicial ascertainment. It means veterans who are in your old soldiers' homes, whom the superintendent may recommend to go in and the chief of the department says shall go in the insane asylum, under his signature, without a trial in court. It means ex-service men who served our Nation in the World War in France, because they are shell shocked, may on the order of the Director of the Veterans' Bureau be locked up behind bars in an insane asylum without any ascertainment of law or a chance to be heard.

That is the most remarkable situation, indeed. Your Gibson committee, composed of three Republicans and two Democrats, made an investigation of this insane asylum. They spent days and weeks of hard work upon it and have filed here in Congress, under the authorization which put them to work, a unanimous report. Every member of that committee signed it; and let me show you our unanimous report. This report is signed by our colleagues, Hon. E. W. GIBSON, a distinguished lawyer of Vermont; by Hon. FRANK L. BOWMAN, a distinguished lawyer of West Virginia; by Hon. ROBERT D. HOUSTON, a distinguished lawyer of Delaware; by Hon. RALPH GILBERT, of Kentucky, who has been a distinguished jurist in his State; and it was signed also by your humble servant. It is a unanimous report, and here is what it says:

The United States Government uses St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of its insane. Patients are committed upon a written order of the War Department, the Navy Department, the Public Health Service, the Veterans' Bureau, or other governmental agencies.

Now listen carefully to this most remarkable finding of fact quoted from this unanimous report of your committee:

Of the 4,400 patients detained at St. Elizabeths, about 50 per cent of them have never been adjudged insane.

Is not that simply outrageous? That 2,200 Americans should be locked up behind bars for life in an insane asylum, without ever having the chance of proving their sanity by a jury of their peers? For many are kept incommunicado and have no means of obtaining redress in court.

PROPOSED CORRECTIVE LEGISLATION

Our committee, in this unanimous report, recommended to Congress that corrective legislation be passed. Let me read what our committee proposed:

The subcommittee is of the opinion that specific laws should be enacted covering the commitment of people claimed to be insane, and the subsequent determination of insanity by proper court proceedings in order to safeguard constitutional guaranties and protect the public at large. To meet this situation the subcommittee proposes House bill 12173, now before the full committee.

That ought to be the most important legislation before this Congress. We should not permit anything else to sidetrack it. I hope that all of you colleagues will help us pass it.

INSANE ASYLUMS WORSE THAN PENITENTIARIES

When a man goes to the penitentiary he is sent for a definite term, and when his sentence expires he is free again, and in many instances society forgives him and he finds a place again. But when a man is sent to the insane asylum it is for life, and he can never remove the blot from his life. However sane he is, he may go into court and regain his freedom, but the world never forgets that he has been in an insane asylum, and his every act is criticized and looked upon with suspicion.

ARMY SHOULD NOT HAVE THIS POWER

The Secretary of War should not have the power to send a man to an insane asylum without giving him a hearing in court.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SHOULD NOT HAVE IT

The Department of Justice should not have the power to send a man to an insane asylum without giving him a trial before his peers. There are now some men in this St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum whose terms in the Federal penitentiary have long since expired, and who are sane, and who are still kept incarcerated in this insane asylum by order of the Department of Justice.

NAVY SHOULD NOT HAVE THIS POWER

The Secretary of the Navy should not have the power to send a man to an insane asylum without having him regularly adjudged insane in a competent court.

There are many jealousies existing in the Army and many in the Navy. Some stand in the way of others. Some are not liked socially. Some are not docile. Some would get promotions that others want. Imagined discourtesies exist. Spleen exists. Hatreds exist. Vengeance must be had. And many men are railroaded into St. Elizabeths by the Army, the Navy, the Veterans' Bureau, and the Department of Justice.

St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum has become the clearing house for all of the envy, jealousy, spleen, malice, and hatred that exists in the personnel of the United States Army and the United States Navy.

I have in mind a splendid young man who has been 20 years in the naval service. He is a lieutenant commander. He ranks with a major in the Army. I understand he will become a commander next year if he is not sidetracked, and there has been an effort made for over a year to put him out of business, and he is in the insane asylum now, and this very morning, in the presence of Doctor Main, the leading physician over there, and in the presence of Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, I put this man through a rigid examination that led back to the day he was born, and I never heard a man give more intelligent answers to every question I propounded to him. That man is no more insane than you are.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read this affidavit in my time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. By whom was he committed?

Mr. BLANTON. He was committed by order of the Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the affidavit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFFIDAVIT OF MRS. BETTY SANDLIN

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

I, Mrs. Betty Sandlin, being sworn, upon oath state: I am the wife of Lieut. Commander Harry Till Sandlin, who for 20 years has been in the United States Navy; I am 22 years of age, and married Commander Sandlin in Constantinople on the 1st day of August, 1922, and have lived with him continually since then as his wife; Commander Sandlin separated from his first wife about 14 years ago, and each year until 1924 paid her a certain portion of his salary, and since he stopped paying her in 1924 she has been trying to give him all the trouble she could, and has caused friction between him and the Navy. In February, 1925, in Key West, Doctor Dockery (?), of the Navy, told me that they intended to retire my husband, and in 1925 they had him brought before a retiring board, at which hearing I testified and told what Doctor Dockery had said to me, and they could not retire him, as they were not able to prove any reasons therefor, and my husband then defended himself against such proposal; but they sent my husband to the naval hospital in Washington for observation, and threatened to send him to St. Elizabeths. They could find nothing wrong with my husband and finally sent him back to duty in Philadelphia, and his commanding officer reported that his work was first class; because my husband insisted on having an investigation, they sent him to St. Elizabeths Hospital, which is an insane asylum, on November 8, 1926, where he now is, and where they have kept him ever since; he has been given to understand that if he will agree to being retired they will release him from the hospital; there is nothing whatever wrong with my husband; his mind is clear and he is perfectly sane, and he is in no way mentally afflicted; he is not a graduate of Annapolis; my husband's sister, Mrs. W. A. Mattice, of 1307 Chamberlain Avenue, Chattanooga, Tenn., with the approval of myself and husband, requested the Navy Department to send her a "comprehensive and detailed report of his present condition, and circumstances leading up to his present status, and copies of reports of all investigating boards," and on November 18, 1926, the Secretary of the Navy refused, claiming that same were confidential, after which my husband, in writing, requested that such be sent his sister, but they have not been furnished her. I feel that my husband is being unjustly and unmercifully persecuted, and I appeal to the Congress of the United States to see that we get justice.

BETTY SANDLIN.

Sworn to and subscribed by the said Mrs. Betty Sandlin before me this the 14th day of December, A. D. 1926. Given under my hand and seal of office in the District of Columbia.

[SEAL.]

W. G. LADD.

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

(My commission expires August 26, 1929.)

Mr. BLANTON. I want the Clerk now to read an affidavit from an eminent scientist of the United States, Dr. S. F. Acree. I have known him for over 30 years. He and I entered the State University together in 1892. He knows this Commander Sandlin well. He has been his neighbor and friend. He lives in Washington now, and I want you to hear the affidavit.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the affidavit.

There was no objection.

AFFIDAVIT OF DR. S. F. ACREE

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

I, Dr. S. F. Acree, being sworn, upon oath state: I am a native of the State of Texas, entered the University of Texas in 1892, and am a graduate of that institution, and am also a graduate of the University of Chicago, and am now engaged in scientific work and live at 1756 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C. During 1925 I lived at 1704 Q Street and we took our meals at 1754 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C., and for over three months we, my wife and I, were thrown in daily communication with Commander Harry Till Sandlin, of the United States Navy, and his wife, Mrs. Betty Sandlin, and we saw each other at least twice each day, and sometimes many times each day, and frequently had our meals together; and this relationship existed during all of the time that Commander Sandlin was under observation by the naval hospital here in Washington; on account of such treatment accorded him, I specially and closely observed Commander Sandlin, with the view of forming my own conclusion of whether he was mentally afflicted, and I reached the conclusion that there was nothing whatever wrong with his mind and that he was in no way afflicted mentally; his mind was clear at all times and I considered him a brilliant man and unusually well poised; and since he was placed in St. Elizabeths Hospital on November 8, 1926, I have been to see him many times and have talked with him on many subjects, and have closely observed him, and there is no change whatever in his mental condition; and in my judgment there is now nothing whatever wrong with his mind and he is in no way mentally afflicted. During one of my visits to St. Elizabeths Hospital to see Commander Sandlin I met Doctor Ziegler, who is in charge of the naval hospital here in Washington, and Doctor Ziegler in substance gave me to understand that if Commander Sandlin would agree to the

Navy retiring him that he would be released shortly from St. Elizabeths; in my judgment Commander Sandlin is in every way, physically and mentally, able to perform his duties. I am in no way related to Commander Sandlin, but am interested in seeing that he is not treated unjustly.

Dr. S. F. ACREE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me by Dr. S. F. Acree, on this 14th day of December, A. D. 1926. Given under my hand and seal of office in Washington, D. C.

[SEAL.]

W. G. LADD,

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

(My commission expires August 26, 1929.)

Mr. BLANTON. I now want to have read to you by the Clerk an affidavit from Mrs. Ruby J. Acree, who, also, has been their neighbor, companion, and friend during this time. The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the affidavit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFFIDAVIT OF MRS. RUBY J. ACREE

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

I, Mrs. Ruby J. Acree, being duly sworn, upon oath, state: I am a native of Virginia and am the wife of Dr. S. F. Acree; I have read the affidavit made by him regarding the condition and treatment of Commander Harry Till Sandlin, and I know that same is true and correct; I have never observed anything wrong with Commander Sandlin and believe that he is mentally sound and is in no way mentally afflicted; I consider him unusually well poised; I am in no way related to them, but feel sorry for Mrs. Betty Sandlin, who is a young girl 22 years of age.

RUBY J. ACREE.

Sworn to and subscribed by the said Mrs. Ruby J. Acree before me this the 14th day of December, A. D. 1926. Given under my hand and seal of office in Washington, D. C.

[SEAL.]

W. G. LADD,

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

(My commission expires August 26, 1929.)

FIRST WIFE CAUSED HIM TROUBLE

Mr. BLANTON. Now, I happen to know that Lieut. Commander Harry T. Sandlin after he separated with his first wife in 1914 paid her \$85 per month out of his salary from 1914 until 1920, when he was divorced, and then after being divorced he paid her about four or five thousand dollars between 1920 and 1924, and she has caused him much trouble with the Navy.

His present wife has been married to him for four years and is a little slip of a girl only 22 years old and has two children and has been suffering agonies ever since they began persecuting her husband, and especially so since they put him in St. Elizabeths last month.

SISTER DENIED REQUESTED INFORMATION

Mrs. W. A. Mattice, of 1307 Chamberlain Avenue, Chattanooga, Tenn., is a sister of Commander Sandlin, and she demanded copies of his record and case and was turned down by the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 18, 1926.

Mrs. W. A. MATTICE,
1307 Chamberlain Avenue, Chattanooga, Tenn.

DEAR MADAM: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 11, in which you desire a comprehensive and detailed report regarding the present condition of your brother, Lieut. Commander H. T. Sandlin (S. C.), United States Navy, a complete review and report of all the circumstances leading up to his present status, copies of the reports of investigating boards handling your brother's case, and information as to whether or not he has had a regular hearing or investigation in accordance with Navy Regulations, and the result of such reports.

Your brother has been accorded all his rights in connection with his present status as required by Navy Regulations. The department regrets, however, that it is unable to furnish the information you request, inasmuch as such information forms part of the official record of Mr. Sandlin and is therefore confidential. It is for official use of the department only and can not be given to any other except by order of the officer himself or by order of a court in case such information should be necessary and material in a case on trial before it.

It is true that your brother was recently placed in St. Elizabeths Hospital. If you address a letter to the superintendent of that institution, you will no doubt be able to ascertain the present condition of his health.

Very respectfully,

CURTIS D. WILBUR.

I was promised yesterday by the Secretary of the Navy that he would furnish me a copy of this man's record, but I have not yet received it.

CASE OF LIEUT. FRANK D. ALLEN

You will remember, gentlemen, that last May I called your attention to another naval officer wrongfully committed to this St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum by the Navy Department, when he was perfectly sane. Doctor White, and his assistant, Doctor Noyes, tried in every way possible to prevent Allen from having a hearing before our committee. I forced them to bring him before us, and it may be interesting to you for me to quote a few excerpts from the hearings to show you the attitude of the St. Elizabeths officials, which I now do:

Mr. GIBSON. The committee will be in order. Do you wish to proceed?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. Allen, will you come around here?

STATEMENT OF FRANK D. ALLEN

Doctor NOYES. May I ask that that examination of patients be in executive session? It seems hardly fair to exploit helpless patients whom we believe to be suffering from mental disease, before the public.

Mr. BLANTON. * * * It does not behoove the St. Elizabeths administration to come here now and demand a closed session. It does not look well for Doctor White to demand it. It does not look well for Mr. Fenning to demand it. It does not look well for Doctor Noyes to demand it, who is really the active man who does all the business out in St. Elizabeths for Doctor White.

Now, Mr. Allen, do you want an open meeting or a closed one?

Mr. ALLEN. I want an open meeting.

Mr. BLANTON. You want your meeting to be held before the people?

Mr. ALLEN. Before the people.

Mr. BLANTON. You don't want us to stay in here and close all these people out?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that we pay no attention to Doctor Noyes' suggestion. * * * Here is a man who is a retired lieutenant of the United States Navy. He has the rank of captain in the United States Army. He will take care of himself here. Doctor Noyes need not be uneasy about anybody exploiting this man.

Mr. ALLEN. I have a good record.

Mr. BLANTON. There will be no danger about his being embarrassed.

Doctor NOYES. I should like to say that when I am asking this it is only for the protection of these patients.

Mr. GIBSON. You wanted to give us a diagnosis of their cases?

Doctor NOYES. Yes; a diagnosis.

Mr. BLANTON. I want this committee to diagnose these cases, and I want the people of Washington to diagnose them.

Doctor NOYES. You see, the proper nature of their diseases can not be explained to the committee, I believe, unless it is explained by some one who has had professional training.

Mr. BLANTON. That will come later. I make a point of order that this—

Mr. GIBSON. He is a doctor and it would not be out of order—

Mr. BLANTON. Your defense can come in later.

Mr. GIBSON. This is not exactly in the nature of a defense.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, it is.

Mr. GIBSON. It is an explanation of their situation and their condition.

Mr. BLANTON. I see that they have brought their manhandler here—Taylor—on whom Strangler Lewis hasn't anything at all. I will put him up against Strangler Lewis any day.

Mr. ALLEN. He choked me many times.

Mr. GIBSON. Would it not be better to let these men testify and then you will have an ample opportunity to go into their condition?

Doctor NOYES. So long as we can explain their condition to the committee and let them know—

Mr. GIBSON. In the orderly process they are entitled to be heard first.

Doctor NOYES. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to say to the doctor that after the examination is over, if he wants to ask the gentlemen any questions, I think the committee will be inclined to permit him.

Mr. BLANTON. If they are not such as will exploit and embarrass him, I will not object.

Mr. ALLEN. I am not afraid of being embarrassed.

And I had all the trouble shown above, before I could bring the testimony of Lieutenant Allen before our committee. It convinced his hearers that he was sane. I will quote just a few excerpts from it:

Mr. BLANTON. Lieutenant Allen, when you entered the Navy, you did not come up to be a lieutenant through Annapolis?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You came up from the ranks?

Mr. ALLEN. I came up through the ranks.

Mr. BLANTON. How many trips across the water did you make during the World War?

Mr. ALLEN. Counting going back and forth I made 20.
 Mr. BLANTON. Twenty?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes. Bringing soldiers back and bringing them over.
 Mr. BLANTON. To what does the grade of lieutenant in the Navy correspond in the Army?
 Mr. ALLEN. Captain.
 Mr. BLANTON. You retired on retired pay when?
 Mr. ALLEN. In 1923, September 13.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever live with Mrs. Anna Smith of Chester, Pa.?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes.
 Mr. BLANTON. How long?
 Mr. ALLEN. I lived there practically two years.
 Mr. BLANTON. You gave her your bank check for \$1,000?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes; a thousand dollar bank check.
 Mr. BLANTON. She had the check paid?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes; she had the check paid.
 Mr. BLANTON. For a cash payment on some property?
 Mr. ALLEN. As a cash payment.
 Mr. BLANTON. How much was the value of this property that you were buying?
 Mr. ALLEN. \$3,800.
 Mr. BLANTON. That is, you paid a thousand dollars?
 Mr. ALLEN. A thousand dollars as a deposit.
 Mr. BLANTON. And you still owed \$2,800?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you say that you paid somebody the sum of \$300?
 Mr. ALLEN. I sent Tracy & Pearl \$300.
 Mr. BLANTON. Tracy & Pearl was a real estate firm?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes. He is very wealthy. He is a very good friend of mine.
 Mr. BLANTON. The case papers down here show that Mr. Fenning has come into court and asked permission to bring suit against this Anna Smith to get your \$1,000 back.
 Mr. ALLEN. He came over to see me. What I don't like is that he came on Sunday about his business. He was very unpleasant to me. I didn't like him. He said, "I am your guardian."
 Mr. BLANTON. How many times did he come to see you?
 Mr. ALLEN. Twice.

Mr. BLANTON. He asked the court to give him authority to sell your lots in New York that your \$300 covered. He said that you are entitled to those three lots. Would you like the court to give him authority to sell them? Did you ever authorize him to do that?
 Mr. ALLEN. No. I never did. I never talked to him about it.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever authorize him to sell your lots in New York for you?
 Mr. ALLEN. No.
 Mr. BLANTON. If he is trying to sell your lots he is doing it without your authority?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes.
 Mr. BLANTON. Have you ever authorized him to bring suit in Chester, Pa.?
 Mr. ALLEN. No.
 Mr. BLANTON. To take that property back from Mrs. Anna Smith?
 Mr. ALLEN. No.
 Mr. BLANTON. Have you ever authorized anybody to try to get your thousand dollars back?
 Mr. ALLEN. No, sir. That man came there and told me, he said, "I brought suit through the Cambridge Trust Co. to sue those people and get this money."

WHY HE WAS SENT TO ST. ELIZABETHS

Mr. BLANTON. You made a trip to Washington after?
 Mr. ALLEN. I was going home.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did anybody down here owe you some money?
 Mr. ALLEN. I came through here. I had written to the department, to Lieutenant Edwards.
 Mr. BLANTON. Edwards was down here in the Navy Department?
 Mr. ALLEN. I had written to the Navy Department, and they referred me to the Naval Hospital and said that a doctor there would take care of that. So when I came through I went to see my cousin that I was raised with, just like children. I ran in there at any time. Next morning I got in a taxicab in golf clothes and I went over to see a doctor and talked to him.
 Mr. BLANTON. You went over where?
 Mr. ALLEN. To the Naval Hospital.
 Mr. BLANTON. Here in Washington?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes; here in Washington. I went in and saw Mr. Edwards. So, while I was talking to Mr. Edwards, this Doctor McDaniel came along and said that he would like to see me and have me examined.

Mr. BLANTON. You told Mr. Edwards that you wanted your money, didn't you?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. What doctor was it that said he would like to examine you?
 Mr. ALLEN. Doctor McDaniel. When he came in and introduced himself he was a stranger. I didn't know him. I was in golf clothes. He said he would like to examine me. I said, "Why, certainly." I had had the T. B. and had practically cured myself, but I wasn't feeling any too good. I had run down from working. I had worked too hard. So they took my clothes off and locked me up.
 Mr. BLANTON. They locked you up?
 Mr. ALLEN. They locked me up, and I wrote letters and asked the nurse, "What am I here for?" She wouldn't answer me. So when Doctor McDaniel came there I said to him, "Doctor, you examined me. When can I go back? I am in business and I would like to get back." He never answered me. So next morning I wrote several letters, but they took my letters and put them in the wastebasket.
 Mr. BLANTON. You wrote several letters?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes. So I couldn't get any talk with anybody. Nobody would talk to me. Nobody would answer me. So I was thrown in an ambulance and sent over here.
 Mr. BLANTON. To St. Elizabeths?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes. I was put in the officers' ward and I was insulted, actually insulted.
 Mr. BLANTON. Is there a kind of jealousy among the regular line officers that come from Annapolis against the men that work their way through the ranks?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes; all the time.
 Mr. BLANTON. Have you ever felt that they were showing you indignities?
 Mr. ALLEN. They wouldn't associate with me at all.
 Mr. BLANTON. The regular line naval officers won't associate with those that come up from the ranks?
 Mr. ALLEN. No, sir.
 Mr. BLANTON. Do you know Mr. Taylor here?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I know him. He choked me lots of times. He threw me down and kicked me down and I hit myself against the side of the table. I asked him one day, I said, "Mr. Taylor, what am I here for?" He said, "Who do you think you are? Do you think you are the Duke of Paris?" He said, "You are behind the ranks now. You are not a lieutenant any more. Get over there and push those shovels." I was insulted and I just stood there, and this fellow grabbed me around the neck and choked me and they kicked me in the stomach.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever see them towel anybody up there?
 Mr. ALLEN. They towel them. We would have to go in, and they would undress me, and this fellow came along one day and kicked me in the stomach.
 Mr. BLANTON. You say that they kicked people in the stomach?
 Mr. ALLEN. Yes. They knocked me down and the others held me while they kicked me.
 Mr. BLANTON. Let me tell you something. If Mr. Taylor ever kicks you in the stomach again, you let me know.
 Mr. ALLEN. I am in his ward.
 Mr. BLANTON. You write a letter and you turn it over to whoever is in charge there and tell them to give it to me.
 Mr. ALLEN. There doesn't seem to be anybody in charge. You don't have anybody to talk to.
 Mr. BLANTON. You asked them to take you before the conference, didn't you?
 Mr. ALLEN. No. I never asked them to take me before the conference.
 Mr. BLANTON. Well, I tried to take you there myself, but they wouldn't let me.
 Now, Lieutenant, when Mr. Fenning became your committee they took you down here before the court. Did they give you a chance to get witnesses?
 Mr. ALLEN. No, sir. I went in the first court and the court found I was all right. I went back to the next court and they had three negroes on the jury and everybody seemed to be asleep. There wasn't a decent-looking man in the jury. So two doctors—one of them never saw me before—got up and swore that I was crazy and didn't know what I was talking about. So I could see that everything was against me and nothing that I could do would be any use, so I didn't say much.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did you know Mr. Fenning then?
 Mr. ALLEN. I didn't know Fenning from nobody at all.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did you ask that he be appointed your guardian?
 Mr. ALLEN. No, sir. I did not.
 Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that the court was going to appoint him your guardian?
 Mr. ALLEN. No. I never saw the man till several days later when he came over to see me and said, "I am your guardian."

WITHOUT TRIAL OR BENEFIT OF CLERGY

Lieut. Frank Allen was railroaded into St. Elizabeths Insane Hospital on the mere edict of the Navy Department, without a trial in court or chance to be heard. When it was found that he was entitled to the retired pay of a lieutenant arrangements were made between Doctor White and Frederick A. Fenning for the latter to become Allen's committee, or guardian, and draw his money and take charge of his bank account and of his property in New York and Chester, Pa. But that required an adjudication in court. And it is interesting to note that in trying to get himself appointed guardian Frederick A. Fenning had a hard time to get a court to adjudge Allen as insane. Read the following letter which Fenning wrote to a relative of Allen—who, by the way, Fenning later paid so much per month out of Allen's income:

Mrs. FLORENCE PICKRELL,

817 Twenty-fifth Street, Newport News, Va.

DEAR MRS. PICKRELL: The case of your brother, Francis D. Allen, came on for hearing yesterday morning. Every effort was made to convince the court that he was of unsound mind, but without avail, and the matter went over for two weeks. When the case is heard Friday, November 6, 1925, I will further advise you in the premises.

Yours very truly,

F. A. FENNING.

EFFORTS TO PROVE INSANITY FUTILE

Now is not that ridiculous? This great expert on proving victims crazy admitted that "he had made every effort to convince the court that Allen was of unsound mind, but without avail"; and this was after Allen had been kept locked behind the bars for a long time in an insane asylum, ordered there by the Secretary of the Navy as being a crazy man. But Fenning finally got him. He finally used enough of his St. Elizabeths special doctors to prove Allen was insane, and then he took charge of his property and money. But soon after Congress adjourned Lieut. Frank Allen secured a writ of habeas corpus and was carried before the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and given a proper hearing, and proved his sanity, and was discharged from this insane asylum, and is now free and doing well.

Mr. SCHAFER. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be a limitation on the appropriation here, so that the taxpayers will not have the burden of taking care of sane people in an insane asylum—such men as George C. Tisdale, who was held for many years in St. Elizabeths and a jury of his peers declared him sane? And since he was released he has been making his way in the world.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think you could do it on this appropriation bill, because the committee would not let you.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, during the last session of Congress the gentleman from Texas and other Members of the House, and outsiders, were successful in bringing to the ground one of those human vultures, Frederick A. Fenning—

Mr. BLANTON. That has passed over the mill, because we have already gotten rid of him.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. But Doctor White is going on in the same channel. Perhaps there is some method by which we could get rid of Doctor White.

Mr. BLANTON. I think when Members of Congress find out how these 4,400 human beings are handled in St. Elizabeths they will get White. I talked to an admiral out there in this insane asylum this morning who is just as intelligent as any man in this House, put there because he interfered with his wife's social standing, and this admiral's salary is now being used by his wife, maintaining herself in society here in the Nation's Capital. If that man had a trial before a court of his peers, he would be turned loose in a minute.

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. I would like to yield to the distinguished physician from Ohio and let him explain his ideas about this matter for a few minutes, but I have not the time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. How was the admiral committed?

Mr. BLANTON. By order of the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of the Interior, Doctor Work, after Congress adjourned, appointed a hand-picked committee of scientific members to investigate St. Elizabeths. I say "hand-picked" because there is an interlocking directorate between every one of them and Doctor White, and I am going to put proof of this in the RECORD. In the first place, the Secretary of the Interior is a distinguished physician himself, and at one time he was in charge of a large hospital in the State of Colorado. Let me give you the facts.

FACTS ABOUT DOCTOR WORK'S HAND-PICKED COMMITTEE

Our Gibson committee has had St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum under investigation since last April. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau has been investigating this asylum. Just before we adjourned, Congress passed my resolution authorizing and directing the Comptroller General of the United States to investigate the finances of this institution, and constantly since July General McCarl has had a big force of his investigators at work there. Notwithstanding all this, the Secretary of the Interior was not satisfied. Without any authority of law he appointed his hand-picked committee, and all of us who were posted knew beforehand that their report would be a whitewash. Doctor Work is a splendid gentleman and I do not question his honesty, but having been a superintendent of a hospital in Colorado himself, his bias is in favor of all such superintendents. Here is the interlocking directorate:

Dr. Hubert Work himself founded and run in the past the Woodcroft Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, Colorado.

Dr. William Alanson White, Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, is a member of both the American Psychiatric Association and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene. Both of these organizations are interlocking and affiliated societies. (See the magazine called Mental Hygiene, July issue, 1926, p. 661.)

All the members of Doctor Work's committee belong to either the one or the other of these societies and are contributors to and contributor. (See the Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 64 West Fifty-sixth Street, New York City, and Mental Hygiene, published at 370 Seventh Avenue, New York.)

Work's committee members are affiliated with White in the following way:

George Milton Kline is a member of the American Psychiatric Association, of the Massachusetts Society for Mental Hygiene, and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

Arthur Hiller Ruggles is a member of the Rhode Island Society for Mental Hygiene and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

Dr. Owen Copp, now of Pennsylvania Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, was formerly of Taunton (Mass.) Insane Hospital, and is a member of the American Psychiatric Association.

Dr. William Logie Russel, of Bloomingdale, N. Y., appointed but could not serve, is a member of both the American Psychiatric Association and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

Dr. Samuel Edwin Smith, psychiatrist, now provost of Indiana University, has been connected with the Northern Indiana Hospital, Logansport, the Eastern Indiana Hospital, Richmond, and he planned and supervised the Indiana Hospital for Insane at Madison, from which place Doctor Work's late wife came. The assistant of Doctor Smith in the University of Indiana, Charles P. Emmerson, is president of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

These superintendents do not like investigations. They do not like to have outsiders come in and investigate the modus operandi of their institutions, and I think we may assume that Doctor Work was in that attitude of mind. Otherwise he would have pursued different methods. Doctor White knew he was to be investigated. He knew when, where, and how to prepare for it. He put special investigation clothes on his entire hospital. Doctor Work had no authority to incur such expense, and when he sent in a bill to the auditor, the Comptroller General of the United States, to have their expenses paid, the auditor turned him down and Doctor Work had to pay the expenses out of some pocket other than that of the Government. I am glad he had to do it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Secretary of the Interior once had charge of an insane asylum?

Mr. BLANTON. He had charge of the Woodcroft Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, in Colorado. I will ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] if that is not so?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. It was an institution that received patients.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. An institution which received patients.

Mr. WINGO. That is one of the things I did not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman two minutes of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I have spent much of my time in the investigation of this institution, because when I began there were over 900 shell-shocked veterans of the World War confined there. Thank God, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau has already moved 488 of them. He has sent them away from there since we began this investigation.

When I had Doctor White on the stand I pinned him down on the fact of his selling his testimony to free criminals. You remember he admitted that he received from Clarence Darrow \$250 a day for 14 days to save the murderous necks of Loeb and Leopold out of the hangman's noose. He testified in Chicago for money when all of his time belongs to the people of this country in the Government institution out at St. Elizabeths. When I examined him in regard to other times where he testified in court for money he at first denied receiving it, and he evaded my questions, but I made him admit that he went to Baltimore and received \$500 cash for two days' time and that he has also testified in Philadelphia and in New York. When I asked him about the Shelley case in Virginia he said, "Shelley? Shelley? Shelley? I do not remember such a case." I asked him, "Did you not get \$500 for testifying in that case?" And he said, "No." Then I put Judge Crandall Mackey, of Virginia, on the stand, and he testified that Doctor White had tried to put a lady into an insane asylum when she was sane and had received \$500 for it, and then Doctor White remembered all of the lady's symptoms.

As it is interesting, let me quote for your information some excerpts from the hearing to show just how I had to corkscrew the facts out of Doctor White:

Mr. BLANTON. * * * Doctor, we were talking about the fees you had received for testifying in criminal cases, and you could not remember the names of the cases. I wanted to help you. Over here in Virginia you testified in the case of Col. W. C. Shelley, did you not?

Doctor WHITE. I do not recall the name—Shelley; that is Colonel Shelley.

Mr. BLANTON. He paid you \$500 for it; don't you remember it?

Doctor WHITE. I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. I will get you so you will remember it, Doctor.

Doctor WHITE. All right; go ahead.

Mr. BLANTON. Colonel Shelley was trying to have his wife adjudged insane—Col. W. C. Shelley, over at Arlington. Mr. Norton was his attorney. Do you remember that?

Doctor WHITE. When was this?

Mr. BLANTON. And a man named Thornton was Mr. Shelley's attorney, and Norton afterwards became a judge. Don't you remember this?

Doctor WHITE. When was this?

Mr. BLANTON. A few years ago.

Doctor WHITE. When?

Mr. BLANTON. I am testing you.

Doctor WHITE. And I don't remember.

Mr. BLANTON. You don't remember?

Doctor WHITE. No; I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. I will try to refresh your memory a little later. You testified in that case, as the records show, that Mrs. Shelley was insane?

Doctor WHITE. Oh, Shelley, Shelley, Shelley.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; Shelley—S-h-e-l-l-e-y—Shelley.

Doctor WHITE. Yes; I think so.

Mr. BLANTON. You think you do? You testified she was insane, and the jury found she was sane; and the court turned her loose by judgment of the court, and you got \$500 in that case?

Doctor WHITE. Well, I don't remember.

Mr. BLANTON. Colonel Shelley paid it to you himself?

Doctor WHITE. I don't believe I did.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not want to deny it because I have the proof of it.

Doctor WHITE. I am not denying anything. I can not remember, nor am I affirming it, either.

Mr. BLANTON. You do remember the Shelley case?

Doctor WHITE. I remember, and it does not sound as if you were quoting anything about it that was so.

Mr. BLANTON. I will remind you of another thing that will refresh your memory: This man Thornton, who was Mrs. Shelley's attorney, afterwards became a judge over there of the circuit court.

Doctor WHITE. I do not remember that.

Mr. BLANTON. And there was another big case involving a big estate tried before him as judge, when he was judge, and you were called over there to testify in that case as an alienist?

Doctor WHITE. What case was that?

Mr. BLANTON. That was a will case. Do you remember that? It involved nearly a million dollars' worth of property. Do you remember that?

Doctor WHITE. I do not remember Judge Thornton. I have no recollection—

Mr. BLANTON. I will give you a little instance about Judge Thornton which may refresh your memory.

Doctor WHITE. I think I know the case you speak of.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me see if you do not remember.

Doctor WHITE. I do not remember anything about Judge Thornton.

Mr. BLANTON. When you began to testify on the stand in that case Judge Thornton turned to you and said, "Doctor White, aren't you the same Doctor White who testified in the Shelley case?" And you said, "Yes, sir; I made a mistake in that case."

Doctor WHITE. I do not remember any such thing, and I do not believe it.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not believe that, do you, Doctor?

Doctor WHITE. No.

Mr. BLANTON. And you will say that is not so?

Doctor WHITE. I am telling you I do not believe it.

JUDGE CRANDALL MACKEY REFRESHED HIS MEMORY

Then I confronted Doctor White with Judge Crandall Mackey, and as soon as he testified, Doctor White remembered all the symptoms of Mrs. Shelley.

Mr. BLANTON. Judge Mackey, state your name.

Mr. MACKEY. Crandall Mackey.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever hold an official position in the State of Virginia?

Mr. MACKEY. I have held several. My last position was Commonwealth's attorney?

Mr. BLANTON. How long were you Commonwealth's attorney of the State of Virginia?

Mr. MACKEY. From 1904 to 1916.

Mr. BLANTON. That was 12 years?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Judge Mackey, do you know anything about the case that was tried in Virginia where a man named—

Mr. MACKEY. William C. Shelley.

Mr. BLANTON. William C. Shelley was attempting to have his wife declared insane?

Mr. MACKEY. I do; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And in which Doctor White testified?

Mr. MACKEY. Doctor White gave an opinion and subsequently testified.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; which was as to whether she was sane or insane.

Mr. MACKEY. That she was of unsound mind; that she was paranoid.

Mr. BLANTON. And what was it the court and jury found?

Mr. MACKEY. The court found that she was of sound mind and not paranoid.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you happen to remember who Mrs. Shelley's attorney was?

Mr. MACKEY. Her attorney was Judge J. B. T. Thornton, of Manassas. At that time he was attorney for the Commonwealth, of Prince William County.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you remember who the attorney for William C. Shelley was—was it Norton?

Mr. MACKEY. Judge Norton, of Alexandria.

Mr. BLANTON. That was the case in which Doctor White received \$500?

Mr. MACKEY. Shelley read me Doctor White's opinion and said he had paid Doctor White \$500 for the opinion.

Mr. BLANTON. You also had some connection with that case later?

Mr. MACKEY. The opinion was read to me that Mrs. Shelley was insane—quite a lengthy opinion—and I was requested to go with Luther Walter, a prominent attorney, and talk with Mrs. Shelley and give my opinion, and Mr. Walter was to give his opinion, as to whether she was insane. We went there and talked to her at great length, after being prepared by having this opinion read to her—of Doctor White read to us—that she was insane and paranoid.

We came back and reported that she was of sound mind and was not insane.

Mr. BLANTON. You differed with Doctor White's opinion?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. State whether or not this Judge Thornton went on the bench afterwards.

Mr. MACKEY. Judge Thornton became judge of the sixteenth judicial circuit, which was my circuit there; and several years thereafter he was trying a will case in Alexandria and Doctor White said that the testator was insane.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish you would tell what happened between Judge Thornton and Doctor White while he was on the witness stand.

Mr. MACKEY. This was related to me by Judge Thornton while I was attorney for the Commonwealth.

Judge Thornton said, "Are you not the Doctor White who has testified Mrs. Shelley was insane?" And he said, "I am." Judge Thornton said, "Was she insane?" And Doctor White said, "No; I was mistaken in that case." Then Judge Thornton said, "How do I

know, Doctor White, that you are not mistaken in this case?" And then he said, "Doctor White, I would not give any credence to what you say in this case."

Mr. BLANTON. Do you recall giving the opinion now, Doctor?
Doctor WHITE. No; I do not. But I recollect something about the Shelley case.

Mr. MACKEY. I read it, and it was read to me.
Doctor WHITE. If my recollection of who Shelley was is correct, it was a long time ago.

Mr. MACKEY. He was a lawyer.
Doctor WHITE. He was a lawyer. My recollection is that I did not say Mrs. Shelley had paranoia. Mrs. Shelley was an unusual case. My recollection is that I made very clearly an entirely different diagnosis, which might easily be mistaken in your mind for one of paranoid; in other words, I made the diagnosis—and this is very technical—that she was a case of manic depressive psychosis, with paranoid ideas in the manic phase; in other words, she was suffering from psychosis of periodic type, and that her ideas during the psychiatric episode were of the paranoid character.

Mr. BLANTON. You do recollect the case now all of a sudden, don't you Doctor?

Doctor WHITE. Oh, I told you I had seen her in consultation, but I did not recollect testifying. I do not now recollect testifying. I told you that I didn't recollect the conversation with the judge on the bench, and I did not believe it had occurred.

Mr. BLANTON. So you do remember the case enough now, Doctor, to say that she had depressive psychosis?

Doctor WHITE. Yes.
Mr. BLANTON. Well, I am glad that you remember. Go ahead and make your statement.

Doctor WHITE. Now, the husband, as I recall, was a lawyer, was he not?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes.
Doctor WHITE. The husband did not believe my diagnosis, and she had a relative—I have forgotten what the relation was—who was an attorney, and he didn't believe it, and he was rather—I do not think it is fair perhaps to say bitter toward me—but very lacking in understanding that situation and antagonistic to me about it. My recollection was that as the years went on these people who had not believed my diagnosis came to an understanding that that diagnosis was correct and came around to me and acknowledged that I was right; and this gentleman, who was a relative and who had been rather on the outs with me, became subsequently one of my very good friends. That is my recollection.

Mr. MACKEY. Mrs. Shelley never was insane. She has led a most useful life as a trained nurse and is a very highly intelligent woman.

Doctor WHITE. It is perfectly possible that I am mixed on the cases.

Mr. MACKEY. I think your recollection is correct, Doctor, because the man you mentioned as a lawyer relative was Assistant Attorney General of the United States afterwards.

Doctor WHITE. That is right.
Mr. MACKEY. And at that time was assistant United States attorney.

NUMEROUS OTHER CASES

I have mentioned only a few cases, gentlemen, when if I had the time I could tell you of numerous ones that show the utter unreliableness and unfitness of Dr. William A. White to have in his charge the destinies of 4,400 human beings out at St. Elizabeths Asylum for the Insane, but I have not the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 94, line 14, after the word "immediately," insert "Provided further, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital of a person for a period of more than 90 days, if such person has not been adjudicated insane or incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction other than a military court after due notice of said proceeding to the next of kin of such person."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That should be offered after the word "Interior," page 97, line 2. I put it in the wrong place before.

I do not believe the amendment is subject to a point of order, because it is clearly a limitation on the amount appropriated. While the amendment will not cure all of the existing evils now prevailing in St. Elizabeths, it will at least provide that the members of the Military and Naval Establishments can not be indefinitely committed to St. Elizabeths by the mere order of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

The amendment would give the institution 90 days' time in which to commence the proceeding. It would provide due and timely notice to the next of kin of the person to be committed. The commitments would have to be made by a civil court of competent jurisdiction and would take away from any other than a civil court the power indefinitely to put any insane person into the hospital. It is the procedure and practice of almost every State of the Union that before a person is declared insane and permanently committed to an institution the competency of such person must be passed upon by a competent court and due notice given to the next of kin.

If the gentleman from Michigan desires to raise the point of order, I would like to know the ground upon which he urges his point of order, because in my judgment the amendment comes entirely within the Holman rule and is clearly a limitation. After the matter has been discussed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who has given St. Elizabeths more study than any other Member of this House, it is obvious that we must do something; and in the absence of any present intention to pass legislation here is an opportunity to put a limitation on the expenditure of the fund and at least protect the members of the Military and Naval Establishments from being indefinitely committed to that institution without due process of law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman consumed three minutes of the five minutes allotted.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield to the gentleman the remainder of my time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is kind enough to yield that time to me. I make a point of order on the amendment, on the ground that it imposes certain new obligations upon the management of the institution. It provides that none of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital of a person for a period of more than 90 days if such person has not been adjudicated insane or incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction other than a military court after due notice of said proceedings to the next of kin of such person.

Now, as to the merits of that proposition at this time, I do not care to address myself. Of course, the purpose the gentleman has in mind no one objects to, but it is a question whether, through his language, he may be accomplishing something that may not be desirable. It is really not an issue on an appropriation bill. This amendment is not strictly a limitation. It does not stop with a provision limiting the expenditure of money.

It places upon the management of the institution the obligation of determining whether all of these things have been done. He must determine whether there has been an adjudication; he must find whether there was due notice of the proceedings given to the next of kin, and so forth.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order. This is clearly a limitation if there ever was one placed upon funds appropriated. It prohibits the support, clothing, and treatment of a patient in St. Elizabeths Hospital for more than 90 days unless what? Unless the authorities in the hospital ascertain that the authority seeking to commit a person to that institution does so under proper legal procedure. It imposes no new duty upon the hospital. To the contrary it limits the amount that may be used and limits the time during which a patient may be supported, maintained, and treated in St. Elizabeths Hospital to a period of 90 days. The precedents are many if the chair will consult them, where like limitations have been placed upon funds. Only last session, in the military bill, we put on a limitation stopping the salary of a recruiting officer who enlisted boys under 21 years of age. Surely in doing that we imposed an extra duty on the recruiting officer to ascertain the correct age of a boy to be enlisted. The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee can not get any parliamentarian in this House to support his contention that this amendment is not within the rules and that it is not a limitation upon public funds.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. I inject myself into this discussion by reason of the fact that I am a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the chairman of its subcommittee on hospitals, and therefore am concerned with the application of this proposed amendment as it relates to the commitment of persons deemed insane, under the authority of the Veterans' Bureau.

At the moment I must confine myself to the question of the point of order. The gentleman from New York is correct, of

course, in saying that limitations have been held to be in order, but I think he would be quite incorrect if he carried his statement to the point of holding that all limitations have been so held. If time permitted I think I could cite to the Chair numerous rulings to the contrary, one I remember, made by myself—while I had the honor of serving as chairman of the committee. I may have been wrong in that instance and other presiding officers may have been wrong, but the best judgment, it seems to me, of the gentlemen who have occupied the position you now hold, is that it is the right and duty of the Chair to go to the intent of the proposal. The intent of this proposal is to legislate. The important question it raises has been considered by the committee to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has referred; recommendations have been made and they ought to be considered in due course by the committee of this House entrusted with legislating upon the matter. Everything proves that the gentleman is submitting a legislative proposal, and if technically the Chair should see fit to admit that proposal it would violate the spirit and thwart the purpose of the rule.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman refers to his interest in veterans and my amendment in its application to persons committed by the Veterans' Bureau. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in my State and the gentleman's State the Veterans' Bureau must go through just such a procedure before it can commit a boy to an institution?

Mr. LUCE. I am quite familiar with that fact, so far as it relates to my State.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the same is true in my State.

Mr. LUCE. I certainly hope that legislation may follow the advice of the committee, to which reference has been made, but I want that to take the orderly course of consideration by a committee of the House, where all phases of the question may be considered and where there may be a deliberate and well-digested determination of what ought to be done. It would be most unfortunate if, by taking advantage of this situation, the gentleman succeeded in procuring legislation before it had been properly considered by a committee of this House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman is simply arguing as to the wisdom of what I seek to bring about by my amendment and not as to its being a germane or proper amendment.

Mr. LUCE. I disclose the fact that the gentleman contemplates legislation in this amendment and that such legislation ought to be secured under the ordinary rules of procedure in this body.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is not legislation at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan). The attention of the present occupant of the chair is called to a line of decisions which seem to be accepted by the House and should, the Chair believes, govern him in passing upon this question.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York evidently, as the Chair sees it, would impose new duties not only upon those who are administering the affairs of the hospital but upon those who must pass upon expenditures and the disbursement of them. It would to some extent change the order of proceedings in the hospital and necessarily impose additional duties. Therefore the Chair feels that the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, under that I will insert the proviso that appears on page 96 with reference to certain payments in advance by the District and others and a statement with reference to the purpose of that language, inasmuch as some question has been raised about it and some fear that the audit is not properly protected:

Provided further, That during the fiscal year 1928 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent, upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department,

or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition by the disbursing agent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

There are about 2,150 District of Columbia patients and 500 other patients from the Veterans' Bureau, Public Health Service, and other Government activities in St. Elizabeths which are not supported from the appropriation in the bill but for which the hospital is reimbursed from appropriations made directly to those services. The appropriation made directly to the hospital in this bill is used to support patients not sent to it by these services and as a working fund to buy supplies and pay employees until such time as reimbursement comes in from these other services. The advance-payments provision is not used in the early months of the fiscal year, because the money in the bill is sufficient to carry all patients with repayments from reimbursable services coming in the regular way. Toward the end of the fiscal year, however, when the money in the bill has become reduced by expenditure, it becomes necessary to use the authority in the bill for advances to carry the District of Columbia and other reimbursement patients, and advances are asked for once a month. If these advances are not made it would be necessary to add \$300,000 to \$400,000 to the item in the bill in order to carry the District of Columbia, which has over 2,000 patients, until such time as the final audit is completed.

There is no irregularity in this practice. The accounts are all audited by the Comptroller General, and the audit is as effective under the practice of advances as it would be without them.

The language used is modeled after the provision in the legislative appropriation bill covering accounts of the various departments for printing at the Government Printing Office.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas the other day, and again to-day, it seems to me, has seriously impugned the good faith, if not the integrity, of the Secretary of the Interior. As the gentleman from Texas and the committee know, I do not hesitate to differ with the Secretary of the Interior in matters of policy when my judgment so dictates, but I have not yet and I never expect to get to the point where I will challenge the good faith of the present Secretary or his integrity. [Applause.] When the gentleman charges that Secretary Work, who is charged with the duty of administering St. Elizabeths Hospital, in view of all the attacks being made on that administration, saw fit to gather five distinguished experts in that sort of work and asked them to conduct an investigation, I say he goes too far when he says that it was only a whitewash and was not a good-faith investigation. [Applause.] I reserve the right to differ with Secretary Work. I expect to again, as I have in the past, but I am willing to admit the other man's integrity of purpose, and there is no foundation for the lack of confidence which the gentleman from Texas has displayed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman ought to yield to me when he says that.

Mr. CRAMTON. After I have finished my statement.

Mr. BLANTON. I said distinctly that I considered Doctor Work a splendid gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, concede his honesty and then we do not differ.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not question his honesty, but I say, being an alienist himself and a former hospital superintendent—

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield further. I cut my time down to give the gentleman time, and I can not give it all to him.

The position of our committee when we took up the items for this institution was this: We found there were seven investigations under way or completed, as follows: First, by a subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia; second, by the Committee of the House on World War Veterans' Relief; third, by the Judiciary Committee of the House; fourth, by investigators from the General Accounting Office by resolution of Congress; fifth, by representatives of the Veterans' Bureau; sixth, by five physicians appointed by the Secretary of the Interior; and, seventh, by the regular board of visitors. Our committee could have spread itself over the front pages of the Washington papers by starting a new investigation, which was within our authority, but we would not have accomplished anything. We have preferred to let these other investigations go their way, to let the legislative committees do their duty, and we have just marked time until

there are some results coming from these various investigations. Therefore we did not add one more investigation to the number.

We bring the bill here with the necessary expenses for the running of the institution and hope it will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Now I yield, if I have any time remaining.

Mr. ROMJUE. Taking into consideration that the committee has given consideration to making this appropriation and in view of what the gentleman has already said about an expert commission making some investigation, I want to ask the gentleman is it his opinion that the St. Elizabeths Hospital is being properly and well managed?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not think the gentleman should ask me that question. I think it would be presumptuous for me to answer, and I know there is a large membership in the House who would not accept my statement either way I made it. My statement would not be conclusive with seven different investigations under way to determine that particular fact. The report I referred to, however, has developed some facts with reference to the need of expansion which I think the House ought to have before it to give such weight to as they may think it worthy of, so that all the facts may be available, but the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] objects to the printing of that report.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MICHENER). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired; all time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, \$125,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I think it would be appropriate for me, as the ranking minority member of the committee in charge of this bill, to supplement briefly what the chairman has said.

Personally I have a very unfavorable impression of the conduct of this insane asylum called a hospital, both as to its management and its superintendent. I think President Coolidge should have called for more resignations than he did. I say frankly that it goes against the grain for me to join in appropriating such enormous sums of money to this institution under its present management. I believe conditions are bad. At the same time, as the chairman of the subcommittee has said, in view of the fact that there are some seven investigations of the institution under way, we thought it was unwise for us to start another investigation, which we have the full authority to do. We thought we would go ahead and make this appropriation for this year and await the determination of these investigations and also await for the present the action of the appropriate legislative committees concerning this institution.

I do feel that something ought to be done with the management of this institution, and personally I do not approve of these long delays in the matter. I think the conditions that have been repeatedly shown to this House abundantly warrant and properly call for much more expeditious action.

I also want to join the chairman of this subcommittee in saying a word about the Secretary of the Interior, whom I have known for nearly 40 years. He is and always has been a public-spirited, thoroughly honorable, very high-class citizen, and an exceptionally efficient public official. He is to-day and for many years has been the most distinguished resident of the Centennial State, and I do not believe there is anybody in Colorado, or anywhere else, who knows him well would impugn the honor or the good faith of Secretary Work. A very few times I have not agreed with his official actions, or policy. That is, I have not always approved of his course pertaining to the public domain and water-right matters in his office of Secretary of the Interior, but I never have for a moment questioned his good faith or his honesty. It is only a question of judgment, and in my own mind I have always believed that the reason his judgment did not coincide with mine was because he was erroneously advised. I feel that the Members of this House from the State of Colorado would be somewhat derelict in their duty to Doctor Work and to our State if some one did not deny and resent any reflection upon our Secretary of the Interior. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's pro forma amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to seven minutes, five minutes for the gentleman from Texas and two minutes for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes, five minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas and two minutes by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to allow either the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] or my friend from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] to place me in a wrong attitude. I prefaced my remarks the other evening, and it is in the RECORD with the statement that I considered Doctor Work a splendid gentleman. I did not question his honesty.

Here is where the trouble lies: He has been superintendent of a prominent hospital in Colorado which admits mental patients. Every one of these superintendents, as I have found in 30 years of public life, has a fellow feeling for each other, because once in a while all such institutions are under investigation. I have contended here that there was a fellow feeling between Work and Doctor White.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think, Mr. Chairman, I ought to state—

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry I can not yield. I do not question Doctor Work's honesty. Take our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE]. He is perfectly honest, but every single step that I took to protect the veterans of the World War from Doctor White and Fenning I found him standing there defending White and Fenning. I do not question his honesty, but I question his judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is criticizing the votes of Members of the House, which is against the rule. He has no right to question the vote of any other Member.

Mr. BLANTON. I can mention what has occurred. Now, take my good friend from Maine [Mr. HERSEY], with whom I had more trouble than I did with any other member on the Judiciary Committee.

My friend from Maine [Mr. HERSEY], a distinguished lawyer, gave me more trouble than did Fenning's attorney, Frank Hogan. I did not have any trouble in handling Hogan. I did not have any trouble in handling Fenning's other two distinguished counsel; my trouble was with the gentleman from Maine, who, although he was not a member of the subcommittee, he was the only member of the Judiciary Committee who was there every single moment of the hearing, hamstringing me at every turn. And after the Congress adjourned he put into the RECORD an extension of remarks comparing Fenning favorably with our Lord and Savior.

Well, that shows you what environment will do. The gentleman from Maine is as honest as he can be. I do not impugn his motives or his honesty; he thought he was doing right, but, my goodness, there is not another man in the United States who would agree with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas complains that the Secretary of the Interior and the commission that he selected, by training and experience, know something about the subject that they were to investigate. I think it is not necessary to reply to that kind of an attack. I think it was all right among the seven investigations to have one investigation made by men who knew something about how to run such an institution.

I ask unanimous consent at this point, for fear it may slip my mind and as the gentleman from Oklahoma is here, to return to page 19 to offer an amendment. If an explanation is desired, I will make it now. It is to offer an amendment which is prepared by the Indian Bureau at the suggestion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to return to page 19 to offer an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and preliminary to offering them I will say that they add nothing to the total of the bill. There was an appropriation of \$200,000 of the tribal fund of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, and the amendment reduces the \$200,000 taken from the fund to \$100,000, and provides a new item for \$100,000 from other funds derived from the Red River leases, as I recall.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 19, line 11, strike out the figures "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, after line 17, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For the payment to the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians of Oklahoma from tribal trust funds established by joint resolution of Congress June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. p. 740), being a part of the Indian share of the money derived from the south half of the Red River, Okla., \$100,000: *Provided*, That the said sum shall be distributed share and share alike to all recognized members of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes who are living on the date of the passage of this act, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 66, line 24, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 66, line 24, strike out all of line 24 and the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 2, on page 67, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Vale project, Oregon: For continuation of construction, \$850,000, of which amount not more than \$100,000 shall be available for the purchase of a proportionate share of interest in the existing storage reservoir of the Warm Springs project, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1927 shall remain available for the fiscal year 1928."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, under the Vale project we are buying a half interest in an existing reservoir, an old project, at a cost of something over \$600,000. Heretofore \$200,000 has been made available. This item is to make available another hundred thousand dollars, and for that purpose increases the appropriation for that project to that amount. The necessity for this comes from this fact. The contract between the new project and the old involves an agreement as to the construction of drainage, for which purpose the old project is to use \$450,000 of the price received for the half interest in the storage reservoir. Other developments have arisen since the bill was up in committee. The Bureau of Reclamation has received telegraphic advices as to the situation in the field and desire the authority and the money to be able to use \$100,000 for a further payment on the half interest in the storage reservoir in order that it may be available for use in further drainage construction. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein the statement of the Bureau of Reclamation and the statement of the Warm Springs irrigation district setting forth the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statements referred to by Mr. CRAMTON are as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Washington, December 13, 1926.

HON. N. J. SINNOTT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: Upon receipt of your letter of December 10, regarding the appropriations available and proposed for 1928 for the Vale project in Oregon, telegraphic request was made upon the Chief Engineer for an outline of the construction program for that project. His reply is as follows:

"Retel, 10th Warm Springs drainage. Present program provides for two electric drag lines, two shifts each, for which present appropriation, \$200,000, if continued, will be ample until June 30, 1928. As district desires favor progress, can put on third machine if \$100,000 additional is provided for drainage from Vale appropriation for 1928 balance included in 1929."

The contract with the Warm Springs irrigation district provides that not more than \$200,000 of the appropriation available for 1927 will be expended for drainage. This provision of the contract was overlooked at the time of preparing memorandum transmitted with office letter of December 3.

The justification presented to subcommittee in charge of the Interior Department appropriation bill proposes the expenditure of \$750,000 in 1928 for main canal construction. The bill (H. R. 14827), as introduced in the House, proposes the following items for Vale:

"For continuation of construction, \$750,000, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1927 shall remain available for the fiscal year 1928."

In view of the desire of the district to have the drainage work progress as rapidly as possible, the bill should be so amended as to provide for expending additional money for drainage.

Very truly yours,

ELWOOD MEAD, Commissioner.

WARMSPRINGS IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
Vale, Oreg., December 10, 1926.

HON. N. J. SINNOTT,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In further reply to your letter of November 29 containing copy of memorandum from Acting Commissioner Dent about which we wired you last night.

In section 4 of this memorandum it is stated that on October 30, 1926, there remained unexpended of the Vale project appropriation \$470,000, and that whatever remains unexpended after June 30, 1927, will be continued available during the fiscal year 1928, and may be used for drainage work of the Warm Springs irrigation district.

In section 2 of the same memorandum is quoted the language of the appropriation bill providing funds for the 1927 fiscal year. You will note that of the \$500,000 appropriated therein this clause, "that not more than \$200,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for purchases of a proportionate interest in the existing storage reservoir of the Warm Springs project * * *."

Now, the only money available for the drainage of the Warm Springs district is that appropriated for the purchase of an interest in the reservoir, and so can not be more than \$200,000. We expect this drainage work to be started in January, and if two dredges are used, as the engineer recommends, the money will be spent at the rate of \$20,000 per month, which will exhaust our appropriation by October, 1926. Without additional appropriation there will be no further drainage until the beginning of the fiscal year 1929.

It is expected to let a contract for the construction of the canals early in 1927, so there will be very little of the remaining appropriation of the Vale project not spent or encumbered by June 30, 1927.

As you know, the land in the Warm Springs district needs drainage very badly, and to procure this drainage the district has sold one-half interest in the reservoir to the Government. With the sale consummated, it has been expected that the drainage would be carried on as rapidly as possible, so that the lands could be reclaimed and the few remaining settlers saved from further loss. The drainage engineers have estimated the cost of the necessary drainage at \$450,000. Using two dredges, at an estimated monthly cost of \$20,000 per month, this work could all be completed in less than two years from time of starting, provided sufficient funds were available to carry the work on efficiently. However, if the work is carried on by one dredge, at an estimated expense of \$10,000 per month, it will require practically four years to complete the drains, and many of the settlers will have abandoned their farms in the meantime. Carrying this work on with only one dredge will also be more expensive, as practically the same expense for engineering and overhead will be necessary each month, whether the work is done in two years or in four years.

The settlers have held on here with the hope that some relief would be forthcoming from the sale of the interest in the reservoir so that they could save their farms and with the coming of the drainage engineers this fall many have been encouraged to stay, with the expectation that their lands would soon be drained and again made productive. Now, practically all of the drains laid out by the engineers are equally important, but of course all can not be excavated at once and some lands will be drained before others. If the work can be carried on expeditiously, those whose lands are not drained first will be willing to wait their turn, but if the work has to drag along or cease for lack of appropriations these settlers will give up and abandon their lands and make the burden that much heavier upon the remaining lands.

To carry the drainage work on efficiently there should not only be appropriated the unexpended balance of the present appropriation but also an additional \$200,000 for the 1928 fiscal year. Now, whether this is made as an additional appropriation or as a part of the present proposed appropriation for 1928 fiscal year for the Vale project is immaterial to us. If it is to be taken from the Vale project appropriation it might be made an indefinite amount, but just a clause added to the appropriation bill setting aside to apply on the purchase of an interest in the Warm Springs Reservoir sufficient to insure the continuous construction of the Warm Springs drainage employing two dredges.

We trust that you will be able to secure for us a sufficient appropriation from some source to insure the rapid construction of the necessary drainage.

With kindest regards, I am, yours very truly,

WARMSPRINGS IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
By CHAS. L. BATCHELDER, Secretary.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman stated that the proposed purchase of this half interest in this reservoir was to be made from an old project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does that mean an established, existing, and going reclamation project in the immediate vicinity of the Vale project?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is an established one. It is going now since they have gotten this relief.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Which way is it going?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is on the up grade now, but we brought salvation to them all right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The object of my inquiry is this. It seems to me that if there were one project which the gentleman characterizes as an old project, it is rather strange that in that immediate vicinity and near enough to the old project to make this reservoir available to the water users in that section, the whole thing was not contemplated and covered in one project instead of two.

Mr. CRAMTON. Here is the situation. A private irrigation district some time ago built the reservoir in question. The reservoir has capacity for more acreage than they have in their district. Here is a proposition to take a new acreage, create a new district, and the Government has committed itself to buying the storage out of this existing reservoir and then constructing these canals and laterals necessary for the development of the new area. The financial condition of the old project was not such that they could have carried on that development, and it was not such that by carrying on that development they could utilize their storage; but by our carrying on the construction and utilizing the storage, we put cash in their hands that alleviates their financial situation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the old project entirely an independent, private operation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; we have no responsibility for the old one. The gentleman will find that in the hearings I express some dissatisfaction with the arrangement made because it was more favorable to the old project than was just to the Government, but that is a matter of administration that we could not correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries: For payment in full or in part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, the balance to be paid from privately contributed funds, \$150,000, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph. It is an appropriation not authorized by law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that has been threshed out repeatedly. Notwithstanding the House has passed a bill providing legislation, the bill has not yet passed the Senate and has not yet become a law. The Committee on Appropriations, however, in obedience to the view of the House, felt obliged to bring in the items recommended by the Budget for Howard University. The matter has been ruled on repeatedly by the Chair, and I am obliged to admit that the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: For equipment, supplies, apparatus, furniture, cases and shelving, stationery, ice, repairs to buildings and grounds, and for other necessary expenses, including \$17,600 for payment to Freedmen's Hospital for heat and light, \$68,000.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order as to that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I make the same concession.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of one additional dormitory building for young women, \$150,000.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order as to that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely reluctant to concede the point of order. I make an appeal to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Lowrey] to withhold his point of order and not make it as to this paragraph. This paragraph is for the purpose of providing dormitory facilities for the girls,

many of whom come from different States, country girls who are not used to the city or to being away from home. It is very much in the interest of their welfare that we should provide dormitory facilities here rather than to have them scattered in private families throughout the city. I appeal to the gentleman to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to proceed somewhat out of order without discussing the point of order, especially in response to the gentleman?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman would be entirely within his parliamentary rights to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LOWREY. I will not withdraw the point of order, but I would like to reply to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I am obliged to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Without any waiver of the gentleman's insistence on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, several times I have spoken briefly in the House against this annual appropriation to Howard University. As long as I remain here I do not expect ever to let it pass without at least raising my voice against it. On that I am conscience bound. The question before us is simply this: Shall we fasten upon our Government permanently the policy of sustaining a great university for negroes in the Capital City? The Congress began these appropriations in 1879 with \$10,000. It has gone on from year to year until the total amount given to this institution out of the money of American taxpayers has reached about four and a half million dollars. And in recent years the annual appropriations have generally ranged between \$250,000 and \$600,000. Like all Government gratuities increase of appetite grows by what it feeds on.

The question is, Shall we stop it or shall we let it go on indefinitely?

First, I do not believe that in the present condition of the negro race a university education is the best way of helping him. He is most in need of a practical and industrial education to make him a thrifty, self-sustaining citizen. In this I am not opposing the advancement of the race. I think you will find me in exact agreement with Booker Washington, the greatest man of his race, and with Julius Rosenwald, that splendid Chicago philanthropist, who has given more money to negro education than any other one man has ever given, and who, in my opinion, has directed his gifts in the most sane and effective way. These two great friends of negro education have at least put great stress on the practical and the industrial.

But even if we admit all that anyone may claim as to the negro's need of college and university education, does it follow that we should provide for this by appropriations of Federal funds? For the hundreds of thousands of young white men and women of America the higher institutions of learning are provided by the State and by philanthropy. The Government gives elementary schools and industrial education to the Indians. But when members of that race want a real college education they find it without a university provided especially for them from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the gentleman whether—

Mr. LOWREY. Without taking it out of my time.

Mr. CRAMTON. I guess the gentleman will have time for this; anyway, the gentleman could get a couple of more minutes. Can the gentleman say whether in Mississippi, the gentleman's State, the Indians are permitted to attend the public schools for whites, or are they permitted to attend public schools maintained for negroes? I ask that question for the reason it was developed in our hearing this year that in the State of North Carolina the Indians of that State are not permitted to attend any schools, either white or colored, and I wondered whether that was the case in the gentleman's State?

Mr. LOWREY. The schools are provided in my State by the Government for the Choctaws that are there.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am speaking about the laws of Mississippi.

Mr. LOWREY. I do not think there is any law with reference to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. What is the custom? Will they permit Indian children to come into the white public schools?

Mr. LOWREY. I do not think there is any law against it.

Mr. CRAMTON. You do not have to have laws there for everything.

Mr. LOWREY. I do not know there is any law on it.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. If the gentleman will permit, does not the gentleman regard the appropriation made out of the Federal public funds in support of agricultural and mechanical colleges and State colleges on a parity with the appropriation here provided for Howard University, of which I approve?

Mr. LOWREY. Which institution?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. In the hearings—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I ask that the gentleman have two additional minutes.

Mr. LOWREY. I think I ought to have a little more than two minutes, because nearly all of my time has been taken up.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College, for instance. Howard University is doing splendid work and is entitled to Federal aid.

Mr. LOWREY. There is really no more reason for using Federal funds to maintain a university for negroes than for Indians or white people. I believe that nine men out of ten in this House would see it that way if they would simply lay aside all political considerations and all questions of personal or party popularity, and face this question squarely as a matter of correct or incorrect governmental policy. In saying this I do not mean to bring an ugly accusation against any of my colleagues, either Democrat or Republican. But the truth is that men of both parties and men, both North and South, have in private conversation suggested to me the purely political ground for continuing this appropriation. To put it very plainly they are afraid that voting against this appropriation will mean a loss of the "colored vote" to them or their party in certain localities. Now, honestly, have we a right to appropriate public funds for the purpose of obtaining votes? Much is being said just now about the illegitimate use of money to influence certain recent senatorial elections. I am in full sympathy with the criticisms that fill the newspapers on this subject. I think the man that undertakes to buy an election with either his own money or that contributed by his friends deserves to be politically damned. But such a man is at least on higher ground than the man who uses the trust funds committed to him by the American taxpayers for a similar purpose.

But I come back to the assertion that there is neither practical nor fundamental reason for maintaining this institution by the appropriation of Government funds. Without any congressional aid to Howard the negro race are as well provided for in the matter of college education as either the Indian race or the white race. Throughout the North the colleges and universities generally are open to all races alike, and there are, besides some well-equipped colleges for the negro race alone. In the South where the large majority of this race live, they have colleges in every State, maintained by both State government and philanthropy, which are as well equipped and sustained as the average college for white students. In fact there are some Southern States where the provision for the negro race is more adequate than the provision for the whites, when we consider the number of young people in each race who are prepared for college. There are reasons why this is true. First, the southern legislatures are providing well for the schooling of the negro at State expense. Second, every Southern State has a large number of negro schools provided for by philanthropy—largely northern philanthropy. Of this latter class there are at least nine boarding schools in my own State. Five of these, and perhaps more, do a college grade of work and have buildings, equipment, and support averaging well with the other boarding schools in the State. I am sure that the Southern States generally, from Virginia to Texas, compare well with Mississippi, in this particular.

Then what valid reason can anyone give why we should disregard all established precedent and principle and support this one and only university by giving it the taxpayers' money which is certainly not committed to us for such a purpose. Some of my good friends make the plea that this is the only school that can really supply the need of the "colored people" for doctors, dentists, and nurses. Admit this, and we only make the appeal to charity more irresistible. Booker Washington said to a Member of this House that the good people of New England would give him anything he asked for his work at Tuskegee. So strong is the appeal of negro education to northern charity that it builds, equips, and maintains an average of one boarding

school to every congressional district in my State. And about an equal number in other Southern States.

And again I call attention to the fact that the \$5,000,000 campaign for Tuskegee and Hampton went over with an ease that makes the average college-endowment campaign look like a dime with a hole in it. And one issue of a Chicago paper was able to make announcement of \$8,000,000 given to negro education.

Of course, as long as Congress appropriates the money of the taxpayers to maintain Howard, philanthropy will not assume the burden. Yet I am thoroughly confident that when we withdraw, philanthropy will step in. Let it be announced to-morrow that the United States Government, after having built this institution up to its present large proportions, now withdraws from it and leaves it to be supported by voluntary gifts; then emphasize if you will that it is the only school offering first-rate advantages for doctors and nurses to serve the "colored population." If we can at all judge the future by the past, Howard would still be well provided for.

But again, if I granted everything claimed by the proponents of this measure, I should still feel that we had no moral right to make these appropriations. I should be driven to this position by the convictions which I expressed on this floor when we were considering the appropriation to the starving people of Europe. In my home State I had been on a committee to raise money for Far East Relief. I had given my Sundays to speaking in churches and elsewhere, pressing upon our people the duty of contributing to this worthy cause. Yet when it came to appropriating the money out of the Government Treasury I maintained, and still maintain, that we had neither legal nor moral right to do it. Our Constitution and our laws define the purposes for which we may use the money entrusted to us by the American taxpayers. Beyond those limitations we have no right to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, unless the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] desires to amend it in the Senate, to have line 14, page 97, stricken out. That is simply the title.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the words "Howard University," on line 14 of page 97, be eliminated. The Chair understood that it had already been eliminated, but there is no objection to the general elimination. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

For officers and employees and compensation for all other professional and other services that may be required and expressly approved by the Secretary of the Interior, \$113,000.

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HAMMER. I rise for the purpose of stating that a certain statement in the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations as to the Hooper School in North Carolina is inaccurate. All the people in North Carolina have public-school facilities, and there is equality in all our schools. On the Wayne Reservation, where there are 3,000 Indians, there are no white people. There are other Indians in the State, and Indians are permitted to go to the white schools if they have no negro blood in them. If they are negroid, they are classified as "colored," and are required to attend school by law. That is a compulsory provision.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am glad to have the information given by the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to recommit the bill. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKEOWN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back immediately with the following amendment: On page 86, after line 25, insert a new paragraph to read:

"None of the appropriations contained in the acts for the National Park Service shall be available for any expenditures in the collection of charges in excess of \$2 for issuing of automobile permits which permit the holder to enter any national parks."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit. Is the gentleman from Michigan going to make it?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to make the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, to the motion to recommit. It is new legislation and imposes new duties on the executive department in the guise of a limitation. That amendment is the same paragraph as was contained in the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and it was ruled out of order by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Tennessee will yield, he will recognize that having made the argument yesterday to the effect that the provision is in order, I have not felt it incumbent upon myself to make a speech on the other side to-day. It is true that the decision of the Chair was, unfortunately, as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is a proper limitation, as was explained yesterday. It does not involve the imposition of new duties. It is a limitation on the expenditure of the money.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not present when the ruling was made touching this point, and is not familiar with it. It seems to the Chair that this is plainly legislation.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will state to the Speaker that this is a limitation upon the expenditure of this money, to allow them to collect not more than a \$2 fee for automobile permits to enter any one of the national parks. It does not prohibit them from charging more than \$2. They are permitted now to charge \$5 and in some instances \$7.50. If this motion to recommit is not within the rule as to limitations upon an appropriation bill, I do not know how to draw one. The bill contained a limitation to put some extra duty on an executive officer, and it was properly sustained. In this amendment I wanted to be fair to the parks where they charge a \$2 fee. I do not want to destroy them, but I wanted to limit the fee to any one park in the United States to not more than \$2. Visitors ought not to pay more than \$2.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this goes further than a mere limitation, and prescribes a duty by limiting the amount of the charge to automobiles. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that it is legislation.

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not want to dispute the ruling of the Chair, but it is not in accordance with my opinion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. CRAMTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REHABILITATION OF THOMAS V. FIELDS

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey be permitted to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey be permitted to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to-day to do rather a rare thing—in fact, I wonder if it has ever been done before—to extend the thanks of a disabled soldier to the Mem-

bers of the House for legislation enacted by them, in order that these war-weary boys may be able to rehabilitate themselves and start anew on their way to success in life.

A constituent of mine, a young man disabled through the World War, writes me to express his gratitude to this honorable body, and it recalls to my mind the words of Edgar Guest:

The gentleman shall always gentle be

Whatever laws the Government may make;

These things shall stand till life's last thread shall break—
Honor and faith and mirth and courtesy.

I take pleasure in reading Mr. Thomas V. Field's letter of appreciation and ask that it be printed in the RECORD:

JERSEY CITY, N. J., December 14, 1926.

Hon. MARY NORTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: On June 30 of this year I was rehabilitated as a beneficiary of the United States Veterans' Bureau in a law course, and as a result thereof I was admitted to practice at the New Jersey bar.

I will appreciate if you will in some way advise the House of Representatives that I am deeply grateful for the legislation enacted which made it possible for me to again become an active participant in a civilian pursuit.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS V. FIELDS.

[Applause.]

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable that a point of order should be raised against the item for Howard University. It was the hope of the majority of the Committee on Education when it reported out House bill S466 in the first session of this Congress, and which received favorable action in the House on July 1, 1926, that it would eliminate this round-about way of taking care of the needs of a very worthy institution. Unfortunately this measure was not passed until the last days of the session, which made it impossible for the Senate to pass it before adjournment. The bill is still pending in the Senate, and those who are the friends of the colored people, those who sympathize with them in their effort and their aspiration to prepare themselves as useful citizens, ardently hope that this measure will receive favorable action in the Senate at this session.

This remarkable university, which started with 5 students and which now has 2,000 students, made up of 1,400 boys and 600 girls, is a credit to the Nation and to those legislators who have fought in its behalf. It has more than justified itself in the character of the students that it has sent out into the world as leaders in almost every profession and vocation. It has been in existence and has had the support of Congress for half a century and has over 6,700 graduates at work in all of the States of the Union and in foreign countries.

There is no one who can successfully challenge the great and almost marvelous work which this institution has done for the well-being of the colored race. Not only this, the white race has benefited greatly from the research work carried on by this institution. Although located in the Capital City of the Nation it is not local in scope or character. This is shown by a list of the States and number of students from each, which I here insert:

Howard University geographical distribution

| States and foreign countries | Liberal arts | Education | Applied science | Music | Religion | Law | Medicine | Dentistry | Pharmacy | Total |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|-------|----------|-----|----------|-----------|----------|-------|
| STATES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alabama..... | 13 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 29 |
| Arizona..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 5 |
| Arkansas..... | 13 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | 3 | | 21 |
| California..... | 6 | 1 | | | | 2 | 4 | 2 | | 15 |
| Colorado..... | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 7 |
| Connecticut..... | 11 | 2 | 3 | | | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 27 |
| Delaware..... | 6 | 1 | | | | | 3 | 1 | | 11 |
| District of Columbia..... | 284 | 166 | 28 | 33 | 22 | 20 | 28 | 10 | 7 | 598 |
| Florida..... | 12 | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 32 |
| Georgia..... | 20 | 5 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 46 |
| Illinois..... | 6 | 5 | | 2 | 2 | | 8 | 1 | 2 | 24 |
| Indiana..... | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 20 |
| Iowa..... | 1 | | | | | | 2 | | | 3 |
| Kansas..... | 12 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 14 |
| Kentucky..... | 19 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | 4 | | 1 | 35 |
| Louisiana..... | 15 | 3 | | | 3 | | 5 | | 3 | 29 |

Howard University geographical distribution—Continued

| States and foreign countries | Liberal arts | Education | Applied science | Musio | Religion | Law | Medicine | Dentistry | Pharmacy | Total |
|------------------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| STATES—continued | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maryland..... | 39 | 32 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 115 |
| Massachusetts..... | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 26 |
| Michigan..... | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| Mississippi..... | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 15 |
| Missouri..... | 16 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 39 |
| Nebraska..... | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| New Jersey..... | 52 | 28 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 119 |
| New York..... | 36 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 18 | 6 | 98 |
| North Carolina..... | 49 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 98 |
| Ohio..... | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 38 |
| Oklahoma..... | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| Oregon..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 66 | 19 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 123 |
| Rhode Island..... | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 11 |
| South Carolina..... | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 42 |
| South Dakota..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Tennessee..... | 9 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21 |
| Texas..... | 32 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 62 |
| Virginia..... | 61 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 24 | 13 | 8 | 164 |
| West Virginia..... | 12 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 36 |
| Wisconsin..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| FOREIGN COUNTRIES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Africa..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| British West Indies..... | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 29 |
| British Guiana, South America..... | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 18 |
| Canada..... | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| Canal Zone..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Central America..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Cuba..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Dominican Republic..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Jamaica..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Porto Rico..... | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| Republic of Colombia..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Virgin Islands..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Total..... | 912 | 372 | 88 | 59 | 114 | 88 | 226 | 101 | 72 | 2,032 |

Evening classes, 115.

The time has come when this annual demonstration of opposition should cease. The policy of aiding Howard University has continued now for 48 years. This policy has justified itself in the eyes of the Nation and has had the hearty approval of those who wish to see the colored race become, in the best sense of the term, useful, law-abiding, educated citizens. It is a long step from bondage to the splendid position which the colored man now occupies in the professional, industrial, and educational activities of the Nation, and this, it must be conceded, is due to the educational facilities which he has enjoyed. This is no time to take a backward step, but, on the contrary, in the light of the conspicuous results obtained by Howard University the Federal Government should continue to lend its encouragement and aid.

I hope that before another session of Congress House bill 8466 will have been passed by the Senate, thus authorizing the annual appropriation and preventing the spectacle of this worthy item being struck out on a point of order as has occurred to-day.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15008) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to four hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15008, the agricultural appropriation bill. Pending that motion, he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to four hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15008) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, with Mr. TREADWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15008, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I desire to express my appreciation of the hearty cooperation of my associates upon the subcommittee in the preparation of this bill. I also desire to express the appreciation of the subcommittee for the efficient services rendered by Mr. Sheild, chief clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and by Mr. Barta, clerk of the subcommittee.

In presenting the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1928 I wish to discuss briefly some of the more important features of the bill. For a detailed explanation of the recommendations of the committee I commend, for your consideration, the report which accompanies this bill.

In brief, the total of the estimates considered by the committee aggregated \$133,136,576, of which sum \$82,500,000 was for the construction of roads under the provisions of the Federal highway act. The total amount recommended to be appropriated is \$128,362,385, a reduction of \$4,774,185 in the Budget estimates. Exclusive of appropriations for road-construction purposes, the recommendations of the committee represent an actual increase over the Budget estimates for strictly departmental activities of \$225,815.

WEATHER BUREAU

In connection with the collection and dissemination of meteorological information of use in weather forecasting the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into contracts and fix rates for such necessary telegraph and telephone service as may be required. Fifteen of the smaller companies entered into formal contracts with the Department of Agriculture for such service, and prior to July 1, 1926, the Western Union Co. furnished similar service under an informal agreement at rates comparable with those of the other companies. However, the Western Union Co. demanded increased rates, and because of the fact that the company was furnishing this service under an informal arrangement, the Secretary of Agriculture was enabled to meet their demand by money specifically appropriated for this purpose in the first deficiency act for 1926. The increased cost of the service by the Western Union Co. is \$168,312. Because the service being furnished by the other companies is under a formal agreement, the contracts having a renewal clause in them, the Comptroller General has ruled that the Secretary of Agriculture is without legal authority to terminate these contracts in order that the rates being paid for similar service may be made uniform. To adjust this inequity and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into formal contracts for telegraph and telephone service, the committee has inserted authority permitting the Secretary to terminate by agreement these inequitable contracts in order that the rates may be made uniform for all companies performing similar service. It is estimated that the additional cost will be approximately \$20,000, which will adjust contracts with about 15 companies, as compared with the sum of \$168,312 necessary to adjust the rates of the Western Union Co. alone.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I want to ask the gentleman whether the Weather Bureau is provided in this bill with sufficient funds to carry on its activities in the most efficient way? Recently it was brought to my attention that the Weather Bureau seemed to be rather circumscribed with reference to carrying on its activities or in expanding them in any way by reason of a very limited appropriation, and I was wondering whether, if it became necessary to employ additional men for essential service, they would have an opportunity to do that. I know that in one instance some arrangement had to be made by which an extension phone was installed in the home of one of

its employees whereby he agreed during his vacation to be accessible whenever wanted, and that was made necessary because they did not have funds enough to employ an additional man or two during an emergency period.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We have made, I think, for this fiscal year very liberal provision for the Weather Bureau. My understanding is that they are given in this bill substantially all that they asked for.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman mean all that the Budget allowed them or all that they asked for?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I understand practically all the department asked for. The committee has never felt it ought to take the responsibility of recommending a larger appropriation than the department requested.

Mr. BRIGGS. I can understand that, just so long as the bureau has not been cut down too much by the Budget and then only the Budget estimate allowed. Now, one other question. Has any provision been made in the bill for cooperation between the Weather Bureau and the various naval compass stations and radio stations, and has any arrangement been made with commercial radio organizations for weather reports, so as to get the increased efficiency in weather reporting which might be obtained through those agencies?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I understand the department cooperates in every reasonable way with other agencies.

Mr. BRIGGS. There was not any special reference made in the hearings with reference to these particular activities?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not recall any.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

For the eradication of tuberculosis in animals the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,964,000 for the fiscal year 1928. Of this sum \$1,086,000 is to be expended for operating expenses and \$4,878,000 for the payment of indemnities. I believe that all members of the committee are familiar with the object of this work, which is to arrest the spread of tuberculosis among livestock through campaigns for the control and eradication of this disease, in cooperation with State agencies. This appropriation represents the contribution of the Federal Government in the shape of indemnities for animals slaughtered and in the general supervision of the work. The movement was started as a Federal-aid proposition, and the States look to the Federal Government for leadership. Contributions by the States toward the prosecution of the eradication campaigns amount to approximately \$11,000,000 per annum. The amount set aside for operating expenses is used for the salaries of veterinarians, traveling expenses, maintenance of office forces in each State, and miscellaneous administrative expenses.

You will note in the bill that of the appropriation recommended \$1,192,000 is made immediately available, to meet any anticipated deficiencies in the appropriations for the current fiscal year. The sum recommended to be appropriated is \$1,200,000 more than the appropriation for 1927.

As you will remember, last year there was a campaign to increase the amount to \$6,000,000. The position of the subcommittee at that time was that it could have only two bases for recommending an appropriation, one an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget and the other a request from the Secretary of the department. I have always been very greatly interested in this work, and it certainly has been a great pleasure for me to vote for this materially increased appropriation for 1928 in accordance with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

For the control of the white-pine blister rust the committee recommends an appropriation of \$471,520, which is an increase of \$100,000 over the amount appropriated for the current year. It is proposed that this increase shall be expended in the western United States, where the Federal Government owns approximately 50 per cent of the total white pine. The value of the white pine in the West is placed at \$322,500,000, and the committee feels that the increase granted is a sound investment in the protection of one of the Government's greatest assets.

This appropriation is \$100,000 in excess of the recommendation of the Budget. The fact, as we understand, is that a large part of the appropriation for this fiscal year is used in the East, under an arrangement made between the Department of Agriculture and the New England and Middle States. We felt we did not want to disturb that arrangement, because the department said it is making very material and satisfactory progress in the control of this blister rust. At the same time we felt the Northwest ought to be as well taken care of as the

Eastern States, and for that reason we recommended the additional appropriation of \$100,000 to meet the situation in the Northwestern States.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS

The committee concurs in the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Budget in establishing a bureau of chemistry and soils in the Department of Agriculture, which will take over all the research work of the department on chemistry and soils. Heretofore the Bureau of Chemistry, in addition to research problems, has been charged with the enforcement of certain regulatory acts, such as the food and drugs act, the tea importation act, and so forth. Under the proposed consolidation all enforcement activities will be conducted by another new agency, to be known as the food, drug, and insecticide administration. This will include work under the food and drugs act, tea act, naval stores act, collaboration with other departments of the Government in the administration of various laws requiring analytical work for their proper enforcement, and the enforcement of the insecticide act.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

I desire to discuss but one subject under the Bureau of Entomology, appropriations for the prevention of the spread of the European corn borer. The committee recommends the sum of \$685,120, of which \$50,000 shall be immediately available. Recent field surveys have not only determined that this formidable pest has invaded two additional States—Indiana and West Virginia—but that it has spread to some 20,000 square miles of additional territory in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Michigan, and that the number of borers present has greatly increased during the year. The encroachment of this pest on the eastern edge of the Corn Belt presents an emergency requiring the immediate establishment of quarantine lines on all principal highways at the edge of the infested regions. No satisfactory method of control or eradication has yet been devised, but I am sure that when some feasible plan has been developed the Committee on Appropriations will not be niggardly in giving that plan all the financial assistance necessary.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman is aware, of course, that there is a concerted movement on the part of the States that are directly affected by the invasion of this corn borer for a very intensive campaign, anticipating a very much larger appropriation. Is the gentleman in position, by reason of the hearings, to indicate what the attitude would be, generally speaking? Did this committee appear before you?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I can give the gentleman the attitude of the subcommittee.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I feel and my associates feel that this pest is a very grave menace to the corn-growing States; that there ought to be the adoption of a policy to be pursued at the earliest practicable moment; and that when that policy has been determined upon, any moneys required to carry it out should be promptly appropriated.

Mr. KETCHAM. Did the hearings disclose any new effort along the line of discovery of any other sort of insect that would prey upon the corn borer, as has been the case with respect to other pests?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. My own impression is that no one knows to-day what to do to meet this menace. I understand there have been some conferences between representatives of the States affected and the administration. I think the subcommittee feels that affirmative action ought to be promptly taken.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am sure, speaking for those of us who come from that section of the country, that we appreciate this favorable attitude of the committee.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit me just a moment. At the present moment, as I understand it, the committee feels that the appropriation provided here is entirely adequate for all the present means we have of combating this pest.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The subcommittee recommends all the department has requested. It is not a question of money. So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon vote to recommend several million dollars as I would the amount carried in this bill, provided a policy should be adopted so that the department will know how to proceed in the most effective way to meet this menace.

Mr. COLE. Is it not true that a policy has been adopted?
Mr. MAGEE of New York. Not that I know of.

Mr. COLE. I understood from a well-known chemist that the only policy possible was the destruction of all the stalks in the infected fields, and not only the stalks but all the vegetation.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is possible at the present time.

Mr. COLE. That is the only policy that has been devised so far.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The subcommittee feels, I may state to the gentleman from Iowa, that Representatives of the States affected and the administration ought to get together and determine upon a policy and present it to the Congress with a request for appropriations to carry it out. Those appropriations can be taken care of in a deficiency bill.

ROAD ITEMS

For the construction of roads and trails the committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,500,000 for the fiscal year 1928. This sum is \$1,500,000 in excess of the appropriation for 1927, but is \$1,000,000 less than the Budget estimate. Since the fiscal year 1923 the policy has been followed of not appropriating the full amounts currently authorized, but only so much as was required to cover the actual disbursements year by year. That, as I understand it, is the plan instituted by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in 1922, making it applicable both to forest roads and trails and also the Federal highway system. Thus the amount actually recommended in the bill is practically immaterial, because under the plan obligations of the Government are met as they accrue, either in the regular annual appropriation bills or in a deficiency bill.

I desire to particularly commend the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, Mr. MacDonald, for the efficient record which the hearings show that he has made during the past year. He states that he will have an estimated unexpended balance on July 1, 1927, of at least \$3,000,000. The recommendation of the Budget for the fiscal year 1928 is \$75,000,000. In view of the estimated unexpended balance for this fiscal year, the committee is confident that the recommendation of \$71,000,000 in this bill will be entirely sufficient.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I only heard the last part of the gentleman's statement. As I understand it, in the last paragraph of this bill there is only \$71,000,000 appropriated for Federal aid to roads. Has the subcommittee taken into consideration that a great many of the States throughout the Union have anticipated that the full appropriation would be made for

this next year? Authorizations are made for two years, and as we have understood and as the various States have understood, I take it, certainly I know my State has so understood, provision has been made for appropriations in these various States, believing they would get a certain amount from the Federal Government. Of course, the pro rata part of each State—

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the gentleman that he probably did not hear the prior statement which I made.

Mr. HASTINGS. I only heard the very last statement which the gentleman made.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. It is immaterial whether we put in this bill \$71,000,000 or \$50,000,000, because, as I stated, under the plan which was adopted in 1922 we appropriate to meet the obligations of the Government as they accrue.

Mr. HASTINGS. How can any State anticipate what its share of this fund is going to be next year? The pro rata share of our State will be out of the \$71,000,000 instead of \$75,000,000.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The department will probably have an unexpended balance of at least \$3,000,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. Has he authority to use the unexpended balance?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Let me explain to the gentleman. In the last deficiency bill there was an item of \$22,000,000. It makes no difference whether the amount required is recommended by the committee or carried in a deficiency bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. This is an item that we are all very deeply interested in.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. If the gentleman will read the hearings and the statements, he will see that it is immaterial whether it is carried in the appropriation bill or in a deficiency bill. One year the committee recommended only \$13,000,000.

To present more clearly the status of appropriations authorized and appropriations to date, I will append, as a part of my remarks, several statements giving the exact status of road-building funds under the provisions of the Federal highway act for both forest roads and trails and the cooperative construction of post roads.

Mr. Chairman, I will append as a part of my remarks several statements giving the exact status of the road-building fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert certain tables and statements in his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statements are as follows:

Apportionments and appropriations of the section 8, forest highway and forest development funds for the construction of forest roads and trails by fiscal years

| Authorized by Congress | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | Total |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Authorized for appropriation: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Act of July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | | | \$10,000,000 |
| Act of Nov. 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212) | | | | | | 5,000,000 | 10,000,000 | | | | | | 15,000,000 |
| Act of June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 660) | | | | | | | | 6,500,000 | 6,500,000 | | | | 13,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 12, 1925 (43 Stat. 889) | | | | | | | | | | 7,500,000 | \$7,500,000 | | 15,000,000 |
| Act of June 22, 1926 (44 Stat. 760) | | | | | | | | | | | | \$7,500,000 | 7,500,000 |
| Total | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 11,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | 60,500,000 |
| Appropriations: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Act of July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | | | 10,000,000 |
| Act of Nov. 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212) | | | | | | 5,000,000 | 10,000,000 | | | | | | 15,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 26, 1923 (42 Stat. 1321) | | | | | | | | 3,000,000 | | | | | 3,000,000 |
| Act of June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 460) | | | | | | | | 3,500,000 | 2,500,000 | | | | 6,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 10, 1925 (43 Stat. 852) | | | | | | | | | 4,000,000 | | | | 4,000,000 |
| Act of Mar. 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 171) | | | | | | | | | | 3,775,000 | | | 3,775,000 |
| Act of May 11, 1926 (44 Stat. 530) | | | | | | | | | | 3,725,000 | 1,275,000 | | 5,000,000 |
| Totals | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 11,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | 8,500,000 | 1,275,000 | | 46,775,000 |
| Balance unappropriated | | | | | | | | | | | 6,225,000 | | 6,225,000 |
| Expenditures | 28,750 | 167,406 | 548,765 | 1,491,341 | 1,213,170 | 1,583,822 | 6,643,148 | 8,562,456 | 9,835,699 | 9,320,180 | 110,516,623 | | 139,596,737 |

¹Estimated.

²Actual to 1926, inclusive.

The cooperative road construction situation
[Apportioned for construction and administration]
APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS BY FISCAL YEARS

| Act | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | Total |
|---|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Act of July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) | \$5,000,000 | \$10,000,000 | \$15,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | \$25,000,000 | | | | | | | | \$75,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 28, 1919 (40 Stat. 1200) | | | 50,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | | | | | | | | 200,000,000 |
| Act of Nov. 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212) | | | | | | \$75,000,000 | | | | | | | 75,000,000 |
| Act of June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 660) | | | | | | | \$50,000,000 | | | | | | 50,000,000 |
| *Act of Feb. 26, 1923 (42 Stat. 1321) | | | | | | | | \$65,000,000 | | | | | 65,000,000 |
| *Act of June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 460) | | | | | | | | | \$75,000,000 | | | | 75,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 12, 1925 (43 Stat. 889) | | | | | | | | | | \$75,000,000 | \$75,000,000 | | 150,000,000 |
| Act of June 22, 1926 (Public 411, 69th Cong.) | | | | | | | | | | | | \$75,000,000 | 75,000,000 |
| Total | 5,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 65,000,000 | 95,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 65,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 765,000,000 |

NOTE.—The act of June 19, 1922, carried authorizations for fiscal years 1923, 1924, and 1925 (*) dates of acts authorizing apportionment of funds previously authorized by act of June 19, 1922.

APPROPRIATIONS MADE BY CONGRESS, BY FISCAL YEARS

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--------------|
| Act of July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) | \$5,000,000 | \$10,000,000 | \$15,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | \$25,000,000 | | | | | | | | \$75,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 28, 1919 (40 Stat. 1200) | | | 50,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | | | | | | | | 200,000,000 |
| Act of Nov. 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212) | | | | | | \$75,000,000 | | | | | | | 75,000,000 |
| Act of Jan. 22, 1923 (42 Stat. 1157) | | | | | | | \$25,000,000 | | | | | | 25,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 26, 1923 (42 Stat. 1321) | | | | | | | | \$29,300,000 | | | | | 29,300,000 |
| Act of June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 460) | | | | | | | | | \$13,000,000 | | | | 13,000,000 |
| Act of Feb. 10, 1925 (43 Stat. 852) | | | | | | 25,000,000 | 35,700,000 | 15,300,000 | | | | | 76,000,000 |
| Act of Mar. 3, 1926 (Public 36, 69th Cong.) | | | | | | | | | 22,900,000 | | | | 22,900,000 |
| Act of May 11, 1926 (Public 214, 69th Cong.) | | | | | | | | | 23,800,000 | \$51,200,000 | | | 75,000,000 |
| Total | 5,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 65,000,000 | 95,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 65,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 51,200,000 | | | 591,200,000 |

TOTAL EXPENDITURES, BY FISCAL YEARS

| | | | |
|------|---------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1917 | \$34,337.85 | 1924 | \$80,447,823.78 |
| 1918 | 574,816.30 | 1925 | 97,472,506.13 |
| 1919 | 2,915,282.76 | 1926 | 89,362,110.64 |
| 1920 | 20,240,774.24 | 1927 (estimated) | 78,600,000.00 |
| 1921 | 57,462,768.07 | 1928 (estimated) | 75,000,000.00 |
| 1922 | 89,946,603.64 | | |
| 1923 | 71,604,708.75 | Total (actual to June 30, 1926) | 510,161,732.16 |

Mr. MAGEE of New York. If any Member has any questions to ask I will try to answer them.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Does the gentleman know whether the legislative committee or the Appropriations Committee has contemplated the building of a national road running east and west from coast to coast or one running from the Canadian line to the Gulf?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We only appropriate after the roads are authorized.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The question was suggested by the fact Senator DU PONT a few days ago introduced a bill to build a great national highway from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast. I thought that probably the gentleman had some knowledge of that particular bill.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I noticed that such a bill would be introduced.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Undoubtedly there is great interest in the old Spanish trail, and a good many believe that it would be of great military value if that road could be built from ocean to ocean running through the Southern States. I made a trip over the Jefferson Highway last summer, and it is my idea that money should be provided to build a real national highway.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I am very much interested in the work of exterminating predatory animals throughout the country. In my State there was expended for 1926 an appropriation of \$13,613. For the year 1927 there is only appropriated \$12,800, a reduction of nearly \$1,000. In my district in South Dakota, as the gentleman knows, there are four or five Indian reservations, and we have considerable public land. We have three national forests. These are natural breeding grounds for predatory animals, and for my part it is difficult to see why there should be a reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. There is no reduction in the amount recommended by the subcommittee. If the gentleman is not satisfied with the amount that his State is receiving, that is a question to be taken up with the department.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I am taking the report of Mr. Henderson, of the Biological Survey, and it seems to me if the appropriation is increased it would be possible to eradicate these animals at once and get rid of them.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. If the gentleman will read the hearings he will find that the progress they are making has been very satisfactory. We do not reduce the appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is the allotment to the several States done by the bureau?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes; we have nothing to do with that at all.

Mr. Chairman, turning aside for a moment from agricultural problems, I desire to express briefly my personal views in reference to H. R. 4548, known as the Fitzgerald bill, which provides for the retirement of emergency Army officers of the World War disabled in the performance of duty 30 per cent or more. I have always favored such retirement, and at every opportunity urged that the Members of the House should be given a chance to vote thereon. Everybody knows of the absolute devotion of these officers to their Government and of their great personal sacrifices during the war. They made a most brilliant record upon the battle fields of France, exhibiting indomitable courage and absolute willingness to make the supreme sacrifice, if needs be, in the service of their country.

I have never heard any objection to this bill which impressed me as having any substantial basis. The time for expression of differences of view has passed and the time of action been too long delayed. When the matter comes up in the House let those who object to this act of justice rise in their seats and state their objections, in order that these gallant officers, their

dependents, and the country may know who the objectors are and their grounds of objection. That is a reasonable proposition.

I feel that if opportunity shall be given, the Members of the House will vote overwhelmingly in favor of this bill. Then all will know, what we know, that justice still reigns here and that our Government will never fail to recognize the heroism and sacrifices of its defenders. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York intends now to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. In view of the fact that the House is now about to be addressed by a gentleman who understands the agricultural problem better than I do—and that is a good deal—and better than most of us, I really think we ought to have a quorum here to hear the discussion. The House is always so good to me that I do not like to make a point of no quorum, but I wish the chairman or somebody else would. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members present, a quorum.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am going to address myself to the agricultural question as it now faces the country. I am glad now that after five years of time there are a great many of our friends who have gotten at least to the point where they are admitting that there is an agricultural problem. [Applause.] I recall that three or four years ago the man who proposed or even suggested that agriculture was going to be in need of assistance along legislative lines was immediately classified as some one who grew up on the prairies out in Nebraska or South Dakota or some place else with the jack rabbits and was not entitled to serious consideration as an economist or as a proponent of legislation. As time has gone on and as this problem has gradually knocked at the doors of the various interests of the country we find that man after man has gradually come in and joined our ranks, and now practically everyone admits, at least, that there is a grave agricultural problem and that it is the duty and the responsibility of this Government to take it up and handle it. [Applause.]

There was introduced in the Senate yesterday the McNary farm relief bill. That bill either has been or will be introduced in the House. The bill follows out the principles that we have been discussing here for four or five years affecting farm relief and the legislation necessary to carry farm relief into effect. It provides for the creation of a board, one man to be selected from each of the 12 Federal land-bank districts. It provides that certain commodities shall come under its supervision. I am one of those who is thoroughly convinced that if you can put machinery of this kind into operation and operate it as to one or two or three or four commodities it will be only a little while until the other commodities, where they have a surplus either seasonal or domestic, whatever it may be, will come in and ask for the benefit of the same machinery and that they be included within the scope of the legislation. We also recognize in this bill the cooperative producers' organization as an agency through which we are to operate. I say to the Members of the House that that agency is never going to be able to fulfill its functions to the satisfaction of the producer unless it has more than a Government loan fund under which it can operate. In other words, I say now that either a revival of the old Fess bill or the Tinchin bill is not going to be enough; and if the administration or the minority comes in here with such a suggestion, in my judgment the only purpose it will serve will be to sand-bag the program that the farm people of this country want; and if it is presented with that purpose, I want the people who are responsible for its being presented here properly indicted and branded accordingly, because I think that will be the purpose of such legislation. [Applause.]

I have listened to a great many people criticizing the farms and the farm people. I have talked in a great many different localities on this question, and I have heard a great many people say that there is only one trouble with the agricultural section out in Iowa, and that is that we are not good business people and that we do not have good judgment, and that if

we would run our banks on sound banking principles we would never have had any trouble. We have just as sound bankers out there as other States of the Union; but if you will take any locality, I care not where the locality is, and automatically between the 1st of July and the 1st of the following January take out from under the bankers from 40 to 60 per cent of the value of their securities they will be going through just the same experience that we have been going through in Iowa, and I come from the center of that great depression. In my home county and in the adjoining county we had 19 banks closed in one day. They have been reorganized by going out and saying to the depositors, "If you will give us a waiver of so much of your deposit, or if you do not do that if you will give us four years in which to pay, we will try to work this problem out." It is not poor banking, and it is the same banker handling exactly the same individual with the same securities that we have had out there for 30 and 40 years. Yet this crisis exists, and it is not only in one locality. It is all over the country. If you take the statistics of the farm-land bank system on foreclosures and real estate charged off, you will find that the per cent of foreclosures according to the total amount of their loans is greater in California, in Spokane, Wash., in Springfield, Mass., in Columbia, S. C., than it is in the Omaha district, in which this territory to which I refer is located. That being the case, the question of farm relief is not a question of the upper Mississippi Valley; it is a question of every part of the United States; and now you are having it down in the cotton States, and you are soon going to have it in other sections of the country. You will find that this is gradually just sinking down and down and down to where the economic status of the farmer is becoming more imperilled all of the while; and yet there are men that have been saying for the past five years that if the farmer will just go home and attend to his own business and work his family a little harder and produce a little more economically all his troubles would be over.

Gentlemen of the House, there are too many things on the outside of his front gate, over which he and his family have absolutely no control, that absolutely fixes the return on every acre of land he has in crops, and for that reason efficiency of production will never solve this problem. You must come to this conclusion now, or come to it in the future. There are other men who say that if you diversify you will be able to solve this problem. Well, they quit raising livestock in Texas and went to raising cotton. What did you solve? You have the cattlemen on the upgrade, and what about cotton? Up in the wheat section two or three years ago you said that if you quit raising wheat and raised corn to diversify, you would work out this problem, and over in Nebraska and South Dakota, southern Minnesota and Kansas you will find there was a tremendous increase in the acreage of corn. Now, what effect has it had upon the corn farmer? So you see you shift the depression from one State to another or from one locality to another. A man said to me, "I think I know how to solve the problem. If you will get a dairy herd of cows and put them in every section of this country you will solve the problem, because dairy products are high. Put 10 milch cows upon every farm in Iowa and it will put the dairy products coming from Wisconsin and New York absolutely off the market. Why, because we can produce dairy products out there a little cheaper than New York and other Eastern States." So you are not going to solve this problem by shifting from one commodity to another. All you do is to heal up the sore on your heel and put it on your nose or your elbow. As a matter of fact, the only way we are going to solve the farm problem is to stabilize the return for the producer, regardless of what commodity he produces. I believe this can be done. Such a system this Government ought to promote, and I believe the time is coming when we will have to admit it. I find that the President in his message has at least come to the conclusion that we ought to address ourselves to this problem. He said:

The important place which agriculture holds in the economic and social life of the Nation can not be overestimated. The National Government is justified in putting forth every effort to make the open country a desirable place to live. No condition meets this requirement which fails to supply a fair return on labor expended and capital invested.

In my opinion cooperative marketing associations will be important aids to the ultimate solution of the problem. It may well be, however, that additional measures will be needed to supplement their efforts. I believe all will agree that such measures should not conflict with the best interests of the cooperatives, but rather assist and strengthen them.

Out of the discussion of various proposals which can be had before the Committees on Agriculture some measure ought to be perfected which would be generally satisfactory.

I want to say now to the House leaders here that the bill I am here supporting absolutely complies with the requirement of the President, and I believe if we ever get this bill before the House we will have votes enough to pass it. And that is the reason I am here to-day. Now, there is another theory, and it is talked among Democrats more than among Republicans, that if you will completely do away with the tariff you will solve the situation. I am doubtful as to that. I do not believe you will, because you are going to destroy your domestic market that is a 90 per cent market at the present time, and therefore you will be making the remedy worse than the disease. But on top of that I am going to stand by the resolution adopted in St. Louis, where men from the cotton States and corn States and wheat States said that a tariff adjustment on certain named commodities might be beneficial, and named steel and aluminum, going back to what we used to call down in Iowa the old Iowa ideas on the tariff. I do not believe those of us from the Central West are going to stand for a high tariff and say there can be no reduction in the tariff on commodities where they make an excessive profit or assist in monopolizing the control of a commodity. The St. Louis meeting out there was a far-reaching meeting.

Note the tariff paragraph in the copy of the resolution attached hereto.

Barron's Weekly makes the following comment on the tariff:

Farmer critics of the tariff are clearly mistaken as to what the tariff is likely to mean to industry and agriculture, respectively, in the future. They assume that whatever superior advantage industry now draws from the tariff is destined to continue. All indications point to the contrary. Agriculture is moving away from and industry toward dependence on foreign markets. Farmers can look forward to a time when their production in most lines will be absorbed by the home market, whereas industry is rapidly acquiring experience as to the effect of export surpluses on domestic prices. There is every likelihood that agriculture will be better placed than industry to profit from the tariff in the near future.

The St. Louis conference was a meeting of minds from the South and the West in an effort to react and formulate a program for a common cause.

This meeting has a significance in the economic history of this country and as time goes on I believe we will appreciate more and more just what that meeting meant to us, and as time goes on I believe we will see that meeting was sowing the seed for uniting interests that have been divided on issues which have long ceased to be material but were very dear to the hearts of the different sections of the country. There is now a real effort to sit down and work out something helpful to both sections.

A little later I want to go into this legislation very fully. I do not believe that I should discuss it in detail now. Why? Because it is not to date reported from the Committee on Agriculture. I believe I have a very good idea of what ought to be reported from the committee. I believe we ought to avoid the pitfalls that we found in the last agricultural relief bill that we had on the floor of this House. I believe we ought to frame this bill so that it can not be attacked with reference to its economic soundness. I know that there are people who are still going to shy away from the equalization fee, which to me is a very essential part of the bill. I know that others are going to say that if you give the farmers a fair price it is going to increase production.

Right here in my remarks I am going to insert two paragraphs of a speech by Gov. Frank Lowden, delivered at the meeting at Chicago, with reference to the matter of overproduction. Added to that, I am going to put in a paragraph out of the findings of the industrial conference board that for two or three years, with its headquarters in New York, made a searching investigation with reference to agriculture. They both say—Governor Lowden and the report of this board—that there can be no immediate danger of overproduction in any of these commodities.

On overproduction Governor Lowden declared as follows:

It is urged, however, that if a program of stabilization such as I have suggested were carried out, there would be greatly increased production, with a surplus so large as to become altogether unmanageable. Is there any basis for this fear? The argument of those who think so runs something like this: "The farmer is now producing at a loss, and still he produces more than the world presently needs. Hence low prices. If he were now receiving profitable prices, he would produce vastly more, with further demoralization of prices."

There are, it seems to me, two vital defects in this line of reasoning. In the first place, the argument assumes that in agriculture, as in industry, unsatisfactory prices always result in reduced production. This is not so. In industry only a small percentage of the cost of

production is in overhead charges. By far the larger factor consists of wages and raw materials. When, therefore, the manufacturer finds himself accumulating a larger surplus than he thinks prudent, he can reduce his production as greatly as he may desire, with something like a corresponding reduction in the cost of operation of his plant. Not so the farmer. The overhead charges of the farmer do not materially change from year to year, whatever his acreage in crops. He furnishes for the most part his own labor. His taxes remain the same. His interest charges are the same. His equipment does not greatly vary. Therefore when prices are low he must increase his acreage of cash crops in order to meet his cash outlay, even though he knows he is not receiving cost of production for a single unit of his product. To illustrate, if the farmer's taxes and interest are the bare necessities of life for himself and his family require a cash outlay of \$2,000, and prices are low, he must push his acreage in cash crops to the limit, with the hope of securing the \$2,000 which stand between him and bankruptcy. Acting as an individual he can not do otherwise. The more desperate, therefore, the financial situation of the farmer is, the more he is inclined to maximum production until he reaches the very end of his resources.

In the next place, any abnormal increase in production would mean the employment of new capital in agriculture. As Sir Josiah Stamp points out, new capital will be tempted into agriculture only if the rewards there are larger than the rewards in other industries. It is not proposed by anyone, so far as I know, to so change the situation as to make the rewards in agriculture larger than they are in other fields. Indeed, if the farmers should receive no more than the mere cost of production they would be much better off than they are to-day. They certainly would be satisfied with a modest return upon their capital employed—a much smaller return than industry generally enjoys. Capital therefore would not be diverted from other activities to agriculture in that situation.

And then the argument proves too much. If it be true that the farmer will overproduce simply because he is getting for his product cost of production with some profit, it follows that the farmer must always sell his product at less than the cost of production. This can not be so unless we are to revise completely our economics.

On increasing the cost of living Governor Lowden said:

It is also objected to, the program I have been discussing, that it will increase the cost of living to the consumer. This may be so temporarily, though in a much less degree than is supposed. However, taking a long-time view, it should have just the opposite effect, as I think I shall be able to show.

The National Industrial Conference Board, in its admirable Report Upon the Agricultural Problem recently issued, finds that agriculture has been able to go on in recent years "largely through sacrifice of its capital assets and through sacrifice of the soil resources of the Nation."

It is clear that the great agricultural plant of America has been running down at a dangerous pace. Of course, this affects, and affects deeply, the farmer. However, it involves the very life of the Nation as well. The people who live in the cities naturally are inclined to interest themselves only in the immediate price they have to pay for food. They do not concern themselves as to whether or not the farmer receives enough to enable him to go on producing. And yet they are vitally interested. For if the farmer does not receive an adequate price he will finally cease to produce. No one, whether manufacturer or farmer, can go on indefinitely producing unless he receives at least the cost of production for the thing he sells. The result will be fewer farmers. This result is already in evidence. A report recently issued by the Department of Agriculture states that the farm population of the United States was reduced by almost a half million during the last year. This trend can not go on very long until there is a shortage of food, with abnormal and unnecessarily high prices to the consumers of food. And that is what the economists predict if nothing be done to avert the calamity; relatively low prices to the farmer for a number of years, and then, because of a shortage of supply, abnormally high prices. The city dweller, therefore, is vitally interested in having the farmer receive such price for his product as to enable him to go on producing.

Experience in other industries has shown that the producer and the consumer are both best served as prices tend to become stabilized. Progress in an industry is measured by its approach to stabilization of price. Wide fluctuations in the price of any commodity always result in a loss to the producer and consumer alike. As one able writer puts it:

"Fluctuations only benefit the speculative middleman. When prices soar, the producer rarely receives the full value of the increase, but the consumer invariably has to pay it. A severe fall in wholesale prices is very rarely fully reflected in the retail price to the consumer but is always completely felt by the producer. It would, therefore, seem that stable prices would benefit both the producer and the consumer."

The tendency in America for the last quarter of a century has been toward stabilized prices save in agriculture alone. In agricultural products, however, the swing of prices in recent years has been more violent than ever before. To illustrate, during the years 1923, 1924, and 1925 the price of hogs fluctuated about 100 per cent. The

fluctuation in the price of pork products to the consumer was about a third of this. During the same period the price of wheat fluctuated 100 per cent. The fluctuation in the price of bread to the consumer was less than 5 per cent. It is clear that the consumer derives no benefit from the low prices at which agricultural products at times have sold.

It is evident that in the interest of the consumer as well as of the producer we should find some means for stabilizing prices of farm products. The price of a commodity can be stabilized only at a point near the cost of production. For if the price continues below cost of production, a sufficient number of producers will fail, production will fall below the needed requirements, and prices will rise. And if an attempt be made to stabilize the price above the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, capital less profitably employed elsewhere will flow into the production of that particular article, the supply will exceed the needed requirements, and prices will fall. Therefore it follows that if we shall succeed in stabilizing farm prices it will have to be at a point covering cost of production with sufficient profit to induce the farmers to go on producing.

(Report of the National Industrial Conference Board on Agricultural Problems in the United States, page 80)

In general, therefore, as to the outlook in respect to production in the United States, there appears to be progressively less likelihood of overexpansion in the future than there has been in the past. Practically all the readily available land for crop production and pasture is now in use. Extensions of acreage are likely to be largely at the expense of pasture, and otherwise only at increasing cost. As has been seen, in comparison with other lines of activity, agriculture by and large is not so profitable under normal conditions that there is any great incentive to extend the margin of cultivation, extensively or intensively, much beyond requirements determined by demand. The average farmer and his family, under present conditions, are working so hard, and the overhead charges for interest and taxes are so high, that stabilization, or even moderate increases, in price would hardly be likely to stimulate any considerable general overexpansion of acreage or production.

The Chicago Tribune, a paper that heretofore has been against us for a good many years, said "that this is the farmers' remedy."

We believe that we ought to find a solution, and as nobody has any other solution to offer, we believe that the farmers ought to be permitted to try their own. The Chicago Tribune declared in a recent issue, as follows:

The Farm Bureau Federation, which speaks for farmers throughout the country, but particularly for the farmers of the Middle West, is continuing the fight for agricultural relief along the old lines. The McNary-Haugen bill has been defeated in successive Congresses, but the farmers are not abandoning its ideas. They may modify the bill in detail, but they will not modify it in principle. They are not impressed by the President's opposition to price fixing. They have the support of Sir Josiah Stamp, the distinguished British economist, in saying that by whatever name the thing is called, the principles which they advocate are not economically unsound and can be made to work.

The farmers are underpaid. Everyone agrees upon that. They have proposed a solution of their problem which they are confident will work, but which eastern financiers are opposing. The farmers say their own contributions will pay the cost of administering their plan and that the increase in domestic prices which will result is only fair in view of the protection given by the tariff to industry and the industrial worker but not the farmer. The farmers are confident that their proposal will place no new burden upon the Treasury.

We believe the farmers are justified in asking for a raise. As we see it, the most serious criticism of their plan by its opponents is that it will not accomplish the purpose for which it is intended. No one can say with certainty whether it will or will not, and the experts, as usual, are divided. We believe the farmers should be given the opportunity to test their proposal. If it doesn't work, they will be the chief sufferers.

I believe that either the administration or the political leadership of either party that now faces this crisis that we see all over the country who will not come in and vote for the passage of one relief program, and yet offers no substitute therefor, ought not to be continued in political power, for the reason that they are not meeting the questions of the day and the demands of the interests of our country, and that is the fundamental principle upon which our democracy is founded. Whenever a government or a party finds that they can not find a solution for the problems that face our people, then that party or that leadership sooner or later has got to be discredited and new leadership has got to be assumed. [Applause.]

Next, I know that all over this country there is this feeling, that if you say you do not believe another man has the right theory, you ought to be able to offer a substitute for his theory, and just recently we found all over the United States an organization known as the United States Chamber of Com-

merce that again wants to start in on a searching study of the fundamental principles that have to do with the economic welfare of the farmer. What is the purpose of that? Why, we remember that only a few years ago this same organization with the same president, Mr. O'Leary, said this program was a visionary idea of some politicians who wanted prestige, and said that the men advocating it have an ambition somewhere, and these people tried to discredit them by saying they were not sincere and are simply endeavoring to increase their own political prestige.

That was the idea that was put out a little while ago, when the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Industrial Conference Board made ready to proceed with another economic study of agriculture. I and others resented it. Why? Because it is simply the case of another filibuster to try to accomplish a delay. As to the Industrial Conference Board, I believe that it did wrong when it joined the National Chamber of Commerce to start in with another economic study to try to tell the farmer how to produce.

I here want to express my appreciation for the splendid work done by the National Industrial Conference Board.

The farmers fully appreciate the research work done by this board and their findings with reference to agriculture, and, on the other hand, they resent the active opposition of the National Chamber of Commerce to the farm-relief program, because said organization is now confessing that it made its decision to oppose farm relief for agriculture without having practical knowledge of the condition of agriculture. Many business organizations have been for five years diagnosing the complaint of the farmer, and unless they make more progress than they have heretofore the patient will be dead before the disease is known or the remedy prescribed.

When Mr. O'Leary, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, says we have to start back where we began five years ago and make this study entirely over again, he is absolutely wrong. I believe that this problem ought to be solved at this short session of Congress. [Applause.] You may think that you can dillydally with it and send it back again, and men may be returned again, but I want to say to you that this is digging deeper and deeper every year, not only in the West but in the far West and in the East and the Southeast and the Northeast, and as it goes on the situation will become more acute, and then we will wake up to find somebody has lost confidence in us because we have not been meeting this question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman to say that he would insert an extract from the speech of Governor Lowden on overproduction?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes; on overproduction.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And Governor Lowden took the position that there is no danger of overproduction?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentleman agrees with Governor Lowden?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. How does the gentleman reconcile that with the fact that this problem presents different features in different years and different localities?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. We had an overproduction of wheat one year, and the next year it was an overproduction of cattle, and the next year it was an overproduction of hogs, and the next year an overproduction of corn. The overproduction seems never to continue in the same commodities for a series of years together. If you will examine the statistics you will find that throughout a cycle of years we have never had what would be known as a general overproduction, but only an overproduction of certain commodities. To-day there is an overproduction of apples, for example, and it would be a good idea if we could have some way to carry over our surplus of apples to another time.

Next, you have fixed in this bill a basis for the control of production, the same as they have it in big business to-day. How does big business limit its production? It does it by limiting the control of its marketing machinery and thereby controlling the production of the commodity. If you had machinery here controlled by a board wherein, if you please, you were going to be able to advise this country as to the situation with reference to the production of any commodity, you could have a very strong influence on the man who was thinking about plowing up his pasture and putting it into corn or plowing up his cotton and putting it into tobacco. In other words, it is simply a matter of instruction and it can come from this board. Then there is another thing, and that is, you can not change from one production to another in a single year.

Iowa can not increase its corn crop by any material acreage and North Dakota can not increase its wheat acreage very materially in any one year. It is a matter of the accumulation of seed; it is an accumulation of livestock; it is an accumulation of labor, and all of these different things. If you will take the three-year cycle you will find that the danger of overproduction is practically a minimum in all of these various commodities. Therefore overproduction is largely a bugaboo that is held up by the fellows who say that they will go in and break down that machinery, and for that reason I believe that these men who have worked out a careful analysis of it are right when they say that the danger of overproduction is nil.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman understands I am not making these inquiries in a spirit of controversy?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Not at all.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman has made a very careful and serious study of this problem. I would like to ask the gentleman this, if he will permit: Is there any commodity, other than cotton, mentioned in the McNary bill that really can be carried over for a period of more than two years?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Oh, finished pork products can be carried over for a long while; wheat can be carried for five years in bins with proper storage.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It can be carried over satisfactorily?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes. Corn can be carried for three years and is carried for three years. I do not know about rice, because I am not a rice man; but I understand rice can be carried in storage, and those are the principal commodities that are mentioned in this bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am wondering whether wheat, for instance, can be economically carried, however, for a period of three or five years?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. It can be carried for five years.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And maintain its integrity?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Not only that, but you can carry it for 15 years and it will grow and can be used for seed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There are, perhaps rare instances where that has been done, but I am speaking about carrying a great quantity.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The only question would be the cost of your storage, whether or not the cost of the storage would eat up the benefit.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman expressed his agreement with the resolutions adopted by the recent farm conference at St. Louis?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would it be possible for the gentleman to insert in his remarks a copy of the resolutions?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. HOWARD. I do not desire to inject anything of a political nature into the gentleman's discussion, but in view of the fact that he has repeatedly mentioned the name of a very prominent person in our country and is going to quote from him, I desire to call his attention to a statement recently made by one standing very near to that element of which the gentleman has also spoken, the United States Chamber of Commerce, that statement being, in effect, that the words of that person, whom the gentleman from Iowa is to quote, were not worthy of consideration because he was too old to understand the problem of agriculture, much less to be a candidate for President of the United States. What personal opinion has the gentleman from Iowa on that subject? [Laughter.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I want to say to my good friend from Nebraska—and he is one of the best friends of agriculture that I know of. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. That, in my judgment, age, with good health, is not nearly so serious a handicap in a candidacy for President as trying to exceed the standard eight years' limit that has been so unanimously fixed by precedent in previous years on presidential candidacies. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Since the gentleman's name has been brought in from whom the gentleman intends to quote—

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. If I have the opportunity.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the account of the St. Louis meeting which I read, or one account of it which I read,

Governor Lowden was quoted as having congratulated the meeting upon the fact that it did not indorse any bill or any plan. I do not know whether the word "bill" or the word "plan" was used, but one or the other, I am quite sure, was used. Is that a fact, that Governor Lowden did not indorse any bill and that he congratulated the meeting upon not doing so?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I have not the data on that and I can not advise you as to that, but I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that, in my judgment, you will find that Gov. Frank O. Lowden will be on record indorsing the plan embodied in the McNary bill in all its details. [Applause.]

FARM RELIEF LEGISLATION

With the introduction of the new farm bill it is conceded by all that the same will embody at least four principles:

First. The creation of a board to be nominated by the farm organizations and the appointment to be made by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Second. That such board shall have the right to declare an operating period on several major raw products, including wheat, corn, rice, and swine.

Third. That said board shall also have the right to designate an agency to handle such commodity under supervision of the board. That price for the product shall be determined by the agency and not by the board.

Fourth. That the board shall have the right, if requested by a majority of the producers of such commodity, to levy an equalization charge against the unit of such commodity as it enters transportation or as it enters the processing plant.

The purpose of this legislation is twofold. First, to give the producers an opportunity and the legislative machinery necessary to channelize the marketing of the commodities into a definite control agency.

Second. Such agency to make the tariff effective on surplus commodities by controlling such surplus in export.

This is not price fixing unless the protective tariff is price fixing. It is not the Government in business unless the Government is in the banking business under the Federal board or in the manufacturing business under the protective-tariff schedules.

The necessity for this legislation is becoming more apparent with each crop season. One year it is depression in wheat, the next in cattle, the next in hogs, the next in corn, and this year in oats and cotton.

Along with the major commodities we might suggest that a similar situation exists with reference to potatoes, apples, and many other commodities. The farmer has no bargaining power under existing conditions. The whole marketing machinery having been organized to take over his commodity at his local station and pay him whatever they wish therefor and then profiteer on the commodity from that point on. The agricultural decline has not been improved in the last three years. In fact there is every indication that the same is growing worse all the time. This being the case, those who ask delay in legislative assistance are contributing to the ruination of our major industry. Farm investments are being depleted, farming localities are disorganized, profits on the farm are at the lowest ebb, and there is no sign in the present economic condition that indicates an improvement in the morrow. Our Government has helped out other interests, why not extend a helping hand to this interest under present conditions?

The essential differences between this bill and the Haugen bill under consideration by the House during the last session are as follows:

First. A change in the method of making nominations by the farm organizations for membership on the board and also an arrangement whereby a representative council can be called for discussion of the marketing problems of any particular commodity rather than the organization of one body to discuss the market problems of all commodities.

Second. Under the provisions of the Haugen bill the agency named by the board was required to maintain a standard of the world price plus the tariff on all commodities, which fixed a definite yardstick under which the agency was compelled to operate. Under the new bill the agency will fix the price according to the economic conditions surrounding the commodity, taking into account the production, the consumption, the world production, the world consumption, and general economic condition everywhere.

Third. Under the provisions of the new bill the equalization fee will not be delayed on any commodity, but will not be invoked until the board is convinced that the majority of the producers of such commodity are desirous of having the same put into operation. The former bill provided for a revolving fund and also for a subsidy covering which there was no pro-

vision for repayment. The new bill provides only for a revolving fund, to be loaned under regulations and paid back upon maturity of the loan.

Fourth. The embargo provision as provided in the Haugen bill is entirely eliminated.

Fifth. In order to control the centralized market and give the agency additional authority, the equalization fee may be imposed when the unit of the commodity enters into state commerce or when the said commodity is processed, such as at the gin for cotton or at the mill for wheat.

Many believe that if agriculture was brushed aside and permitted to drift along for a given number of years that it would revive without legislative assistance or direction. This has only emphasized the crisis through which agriculture is passing, and as the condition in agriculture becomes worse its effect on industry and commerce will become more noticeable and far-reaching. It is admitted by practically all that our country can not be prosperous without prosperous agriculture. Further delay means further economic depression in all lines. The best minds of the day are admitting that prosperity can not continue with agricultural interests on the wane. There is no time like the present to pass this legislation. We have the time at this short session. The suggestion of further study for agriculture is being made by those who have heretofore been opposed to any effort to give legislative relief to the farmer. The studies heretofore made by the committees in Congress and the very thorough research by the industrial conference board of New York prove our case. In my judgment, the party leadership that either admits the lack of a program or shows a disposition to further delay an effort to pass this legislation with no substitute to offer, should be repudiated and dethroned. It is my purpose to leave no stone unturned to bring this question to a final decision at the present session of Congress.

The following letters reflect the farm depression in other States:

A great many people have referred to Iowa as the hotbed of radicalism. Now, let me suggest that it is not only in Iowa that the farmers of this country are depressed. If there is any criterion as to the depression of farm interests in this country, it ought to be found in the reports of the Federal land bank organizations, with its 12 districts in the United States. When they foreclose a mortgage and take over a debtor's real estate, under the law they are compelled to charge off the entire item within five years after it is acquired by foreclosure, or charge off 10 per cent a year. On September 30, 1926, this Government organization made its usual report. The percentage of land values charged off in relation to the total amount of loans ought to be a fair criterion as to the economic status of agriculture in those particular districts. I find that the highest percentage is for Spokane, Wash. The next highest is Berkeley, Calif.; next is Columbia, S. C.; next is Wichita, Kans.; and then comes Springfield, Mass. The percentage in the Springfield, Mass., district, which includes the State of New York, is double the amount in the Omaha district, which includes the State of Iowa, where most of the howling is coming from, according to the popular belief of the press.

The following personal letter from Ohio reflects the feeling and condition in that State:

"Senator Fess has gone so far as to say there is no farm problem in Ohio and to indicate that the farmers here are prosperous. Nothing could be farther from the truth, as you well know without my telling you. I wish to inform you that the grain farmers of Ohio are all in the same boat with the farmers of Iowa."

The condition in north central New York is reflected by the following quotation from a letter recently received:

"We are living in a once prosperous and progressive farming section, and now not more than one-fourth of the farms are actually being farmed. About one-half are abandoned; of the remainder, some are still inhabited, but the people depending upon outside employment for a livelihood, while others are just living upon the land, which will soon be added to the abandoned farms. Very few young men remain on the farms, and a few more years will see most of the men now operating farms in this vicinity in their graves or past working days."

In other words, every claim of the people of Iowa with reference to discrimination against agriculture is also true of agriculture in New England, the Southern States, the Western States, the Pacific States, and the Mississippi Valley. The only difference is that in Iowa agriculture is probably 90 per cent of our economic turnover, while in New England it probably is not 3 per cent of the turnover, and therefore receives little attention.

Loss of farm population, by States named, 1920-1925, United States Census

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| 1. Utah | 22.4 |
| 2. Arizona | 20.5 |
| 3. Montana | 19.0 |
| 4. Massachusetts | 18.2 |
| 5. South Carolina | 15.1 |
| 6. Idaho | 14.3 |

Loss of farm population, by States named, 1920-1925, United States Census—Continued

| | |
|--------------|------|
| 7. Delaware | 12.8 |
| 8. Alabama | 12.7 |
| 9. Indiana | 12.0 |
| 10. Maryland | 10.7 |
| 11. Vermont | 8.0 |

FARM REPRESENTATIVES AT ST. LOUIS ISSUE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The following declaration of principles was adopted by the representatives of farm organizations of the South and West at the St. Louis meeting on November 16 and 17.

COOPERATION BETWEEN MIDWEST, SOUTH, AND WEST

The States of the Middle West, West, and South are predominantly agricultural, and they have common economic interests which justify and should bring about unity of thought and action. We are gratified over the progress that was made during the last winter in bringing together the cotton growers of the South, the wheat growers of the West, and the corn and meat producers of the North-Central States in support of a joint legislative program in Congress. We express the earnest hope that this conference will cement the relationships already established and promote continued unity of thought and action in behalf of a national program for American agriculture. We extend cordial greetings to the farmers of the East and express confidence in their hearty cooperation in carrying out the purposes herein suggested.

CITIES DEPEND UPON AGRICULTURE

Great cities have developed throughout the agricultural regions of the United States for no other reason than to serve a great agricultural population, whose combined life and prosperity are essential, if these cities are to live. A semblance of urban prosperity may result from the period of farm depression, accompanied by high city wages, which drains wealth from the country to the city; but its continuance is only temporary, and eventually these cities will rise or fall with the country upon which they depend. We appeal for recognition of this harmony of interests in a conscious program which will unite city and country back of projects to secure the common economic interests of the agricultural sections of the country.

EXODUS FROM FARMS THREATENS LABOR

In this connection we desire to warn the leaders of American labor that the ever-increasing drift of hundreds of thousands of farm workers to the cities may sooner or later produce a demoralizing oversupply of labor, and, therefore, if our workmen would make secure their present generous standard of living they should do everything in their power to bring about a return of a condition of wholesome contentment on the farm. Not only does the collapse of agriculture menace the security of labor but it should be apparent to all thinking men that we can not hope to maintain our industries in full-time operation unless the purchasing power of the 35,000,000 people who live upon the farms is restored at an early date.

SUPPORT OF OTHER INTERESTS ASKED

We solicit the support of organized commerce, finance, industry, and labor in securing a fair national policy for agriculture; however, we look with disfavor upon any movement of business organizations to initiate an agricultural program independently of farmers' organizations.

CONTROL OF SURPLUS

As a practical and immediate move to secure for agriculture a just and proper share of the national income and a position of equality with other industries in our national economy, we favor legislation that will enable farmers to control and manage excess supplies of crops at their own expense, so as to secure cost of production with a reasonable profit. We assert our conviction that such legislation must function through and foster cooperative marketing.

VARIABLE YIELDS AND PRICES

While acreage cost of production of farm products is fairly constant from year to year, the prices received by farmers frequently vary as much as 50 per cent from one year to the next. No business can be stable and prosperous in which basic costs are fixed and prices vary as prices of agricultural products vary. The same acreage may produce widely different yields in different years; hence certainty of yield can not be attained, even by control of acreage. Weather, plant diseases, and insect pests will continue to influence volume of production in spite of all that man can do.

Any production program that would avert surplus production in normal years would bring scarcity to the point of famine in bad-crop years. The alternation of extremely low and unduly high prices resulting from unavoidable variations in yields is harmful alike to producers and consumers. It upsets orderly production programs of farmers, interferes with normal consumption, increases risks and costs of marketing, and subjects producers and consumers to the hazards of speculation. Wise management of surpluses will tend to stabilize prices for producers and insure adequate and dependable supplies for consumers.

APPROVE GOVERNOR LOWDEN'S PROPOSALS

We believe that the principles and methods advocated by Governor Lowden in his address to this conference for the stabilization of basic

products of agriculture if enacted into law would go far toward the solution of the problem of agricultural surpluses; they strike at the problem that is present in the chief farm products of the Midwest, South, and West; they would provide means for the producers to adjust supply to demand in their markets at fair and stable prices; they would broaden the basis of our national prosperity by restoring the purchasing power of agriculture; and we urge that their enactment should be the united aim of men from all sections who are conscious of the gravity of the agricultural situation and seek a way in which to meet it.

WELCOME CONSTRUCTIVE AID

We welcome the constructive aid of all thoughtful men in perfecting these principles and making them effective through legislation, but we deprecate the spirit of criticism and fault finding which is barren of workable proposals.

THE COTTON CRISIS

We deplore the disastrous decline in the price of cotton to a point far below the cost of production. We attribute this disaster not to reckless overproduction, but to lack of adequate means of handling the temporarily unneeded part of the crop in ways that would make it a blessing to the world and not a curse to cotton farmers. The world needs and will use profitably every bale of cotton produced this year, the excess above immediate needs being only a reasonable insurance against a short crop in future years. We place responsibility for present conditions upon those who defeated the bill in the last session of Congress which would have provided a Federal farm board with ample powers and funds to anticipate and provide for the removal of the excess supply from the market and carry it until there is need for it at profitable prices.

PERMANENT PROGRAM FOR COTTON

We believe that the present collapse of the cotton market emphasizes a need for the further development of cooperative marketing by cotton farmers and for legislation which will strengthen their ability to carry on orderly marketing and make possible the carrying over of the surplus from years of large production to years of small production and assessing the cost ratably against all the products.

The plan of the President's cotton commission can not equitably distribute the cost and hazard of removing 4,000,000 bales of cotton to all the growers of cotton, but imposes the entire cost on a limited number of growers who may participate in the holding movement.

Under no circumstances can the plan amount to more than a temporary expedient to meet the crisis occasioned by the present large crop. It will not work out a sound and permanent national policy respecting cotton, resulting in price stabilization to both the producer, the manufacturer, and the consumer of cotton which sound public policy and the public welfare imperatively demands.

POLITICAL PLATFORMS

We direct attention to the fact that the two major political parties, through their platforms and candidates of 1924, specifically pledged themselves to take every step necessary to secure for agriculture economic equality with other groups in our national life. The leadership of both parties during the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress repudiated these platform pledges and pursued a legislative course that proved they did not regard them seriously. If our political parties are not trustworthy agents of government through which to record the public mind on legislative policies, then the people will find other means inside and outside such parties to accomplish necessary reforms.

CONGRESSIONAL BLOCS

The Congress of the United States has been influenced and controlled since the formation of our Government through bipartisan combinations within Congress, whose Members have held loyalty to an economic interest above party ties. This Nation has accepted and grown accustomed to financial blocs, commercial blocs, industrial blocs, and other groups formed to control legislative action. Therefore we resent the implication that agriculture introduced a new element in legislation when Senators and Representatives from farm districts in both parties began to work together to protect the interests of their States. Furthermore, we believe that such organization among Senators and Representatives from agricultural States and districts has never been as effective or as thoroughgoing as the situation demanded. The farmers of the United States have a right to expect them now to organize themselves into an aggressive and effective unit, regardless of party, to express and work for the economic interests of agriculture in the coming session of Congress.

FARM AND FOREIGN DEBTS

Since the close of the World War many of the leading statesmen of Europe have insisted in all seriousness that unless the United States consents to the cancellation of the debts of our erstwhile allies the economic security of Europe will be seriously menaced, if not rendered impossible. If they are correct in this view that the required repayment of honorable debts of some \$11,000,000,000 in a half century or more of time will seriously menace the future economic security of

Europe, then what of the future economic security of the American farmer, who is at this hour staggering under a farm debt of more than \$12,000,000,000?

INTEREST OF CONSUMERS

We believe that stability in the agricultural price levels and adequate farm production, such as in the long run will only be assured by fair prices, are important in the interest of consumers as well as producers. Development of nation-wide cooperative marketing associations will follow the adoption of an effective plan to stabilize agriculture, provided such a plan does not impose upon members alone of such cooperative association the entire expense of managing crop surpluses. These agencies will lower marketing costs between the farmer and consumer. The consumer will receive much of the saving in all cases and most of it in some.

THE TARIFF

We favor the removal or modification of unfair and excessive tariff duties that now afford shelter for price-fixing monopolies. It is idle to refer to manufactured articles on the free list as benefiting the farmer when materials entering into their manufacture are highly and excessively protected. Therefore we urge immediate reduction on such basic materials as aluminum, steel, and chemicals.

We recommend to farmers' organizations that they make a special study of the effects on agriculture of industrial tariffs and also of the effects of our change from debtor to creditor Nation, and especially of its effects on the accumulation of our agricultural surpluses.

Our "tariff primers" have taught us that the farmer would get his reward through the demand created by the high purchasing power of prosperous industrial classes. We demand that the farmer be given the opportunity to promote the national prosperity by his own increased purchasing power through increased prices.

APPRECIATION OF SUPPORT

We commend those farm-minded Members of Congress, regardless of party, who worked and voted for effective agricultural legislation, and pledge them our active support. The welfare of agriculture is more important than the welfare of individuals or of any political party.

FARM LEADERSHIP

We appeal to the farmers of the United States to ascertain the attitude and performance of their farm-organization leaders in respect to this national farm policy and to hold such leaders strictly accountable to their responsibility of interpreting fairly the interest and opinions of their members.

MEETING OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

In order that such farm legislation as is to be considered in the short session of the Sixty-ninth Congress may be in the hands of Congress and the public at the opening of the session, we respectfully recommend that the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and House meet at once for its study and preparation.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

We distrust those interrelations which appear to give to industrial advisors, who are not without self-interest as dealers or speculators in farm products, the deciding voice not only in influencing the enactment of agricultural legislation but in determining the manner of administration of such laws after enactment.

We believe that a public understanding of such relations would be valuable, and that a thorough investigation would be unfair to no interest or individual; therefore we commend the purpose of Senate Resolution 269, by Senator WHEELER, and urge that it be broadened to include an investigation of the various forces which have been moving toward the subordination of agriculture. We suggest the following as additional lines for such investigation:

(a) The activities of the Department of Commerce to dominate and encroach upon the functions of the Department of Agriculture, including interferences in the personnel of such department.

(b) The source of the opposition toward effective agricultural legislation described by Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in his speech to the Senate, June 14, 1926.

(c) The speculative manipulation of the grain markets, and the circumstances surrounding the restoration of gambling in "puts and calls" by the Chicago Board of Trade.

CONFIDENCE IN FARM RELIEF LEADERS

We express our appreciation of the men who initiated and have for three years carried forward the movement for farm relief legislation and have labored so zealously and effectively to arouse Congress and the country to a realization of the true condition of American agriculture and of the imperative need for remedial legislation.

NO SECTIONALISM NOR PARTISANSHIP

In conclusion, we express our gratification over the spirit of unity and harmony which has been dominant in this conference. It is not only gratifying but highly significant that representative farmers and farm organization leaders from the great agricultural regions of the

Midwest, West, and South have come to know through the discussions and associations of this conference that agriculture in all these sections is faced by the same problems, and that the only hope for relief lies in united efforts. It is worthy of formal recognition and record in this statement that no differences of opinion or interest respecting agricultural conditions, problems, or remedies have appeared among the farmers or farm organizations participating in this conference. This should be heartening to farmers everywhere and inspire renewed hope that the days of division and weakness are to be succeeded by unity and strength, which will regain for agriculture its just share in our national prosperity and its rightful place of equality with other great industries in our national economy.

The proceedings of this conference furnish eloquent proof that the farmers of the United States recognize no sectional lines, no political differences, no commodity rivalry in planning for future cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I reserved this time on yesterday to discuss a bill which I have introduced relating to the agricultural situation. It provides for research and investigation by the Department of Commerce looking to the discovery of new uses for one of our staple agricultural products, and that is cotton. I introduced a bill to direct the Department of Commerce to conduct a scientific and technical research with a view to discovering new and additional uses for cotton. Its object is to increase the consumption of and consequent demand for cotton by finding new uses in the textiles, such as artificial silk, and in various other industries.

I am impelled, however, at this time to notice the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], because, as I view the agricultural problem, we have either got to produce less or else find new uses and new demands for agricultural products if we are to receive satisfactory prices. Without one or the other the problem will not be solved by any temporary or artificial arrangement or machinery. If we are going on from year to year producing the maximum yields of wheat and of cotton and of corn, more than the world will consume at profitable prices, I do not see how we are going to raise artificially that price when we have got to depend upon the world market alone for the marketing of our surplus.

If we could control the world market as we control the domestic market by an economic wall built around the United States, and if we could regulate the foreign market and regulate our production to conform to the world's demand, there would be no reason on earth why the cotton farmer and the corn farmer and the wheat farmer and every other farmer might not obtain a profitable price for his product; but when the gentleman from Iowa says that there is no overproduction of any agricultural product, he refutes his own position, because the whole structure of this artificial arrangement which he advocates is based upon the fact that we are producing more agricultural products than the world will buy, and because of that fact the world will not pay us a profitable price for that product, and therefore he proposes to set up an artificial arrangement which will in some way, out in the land of hope and in the land of expectation, bring us profits which the product itself intrinsically will not bring upon the world market.

The gentleman from Iowa has always been one of those who advocated that we had to maintain here in America a standard of profit in the manufacturing industries that would permit the American manufacturer to reap rich rewards on the pretense that the American laborer employed in the manufacturing industries is entitled to a scale of living better than that enjoyed by similar persons in other countries. He is perfectly content, or has always been, to artificially create that sort of a condition by saying that foreign manufacturers could not ship their goods into America unless they paid an exorbitant tariff tax. Of course, the profits go to the manufacturer and not to the laboring man.

Where is the gentleman from Iowa? I should like for a page to go out and page the gentleman from Iowa and bring him back in here. [Laughter and applause.] Here we have a great agricultural question before the House, a great bill affecting agriculture, and the gentleman from Iowa fires his volley and then retreats to the cloakroom to receive the congratulations of the newspaper correspondents [laughter] instead of remaining here and listening to others discuss this proposition.

I am not taking issue with the gentleman on the necessity of some kind of action for the relief of agriculture; but what does the gentleman do about it? I am very much flattered to

now have the attention and the presence of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I knew the gentleman would be.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the gentleman had known it so strongly, he ought to have stayed in the Chamber instead of absenting himself as soon as some one else took the floor.

The gentleman from Iowa believes in that sort of artificial stimulation of industry in the United States; but at the same time, when he took that sort of action and while he wanted the manufacturer to have an artificial profit, on the plea that the laborer in the factories would receive an artificial profit, he condemns every farmer in his district that raises wheat to compete with the peasant yonder on the steppes of Russia that produces wheat and markets it in the markets of the world, because every bushel of American wheat that goes abroad must meet in the markets of the world the products of Russia and the products from the plains of Rumania and the products of every foreign country on this earth that produces wheat.

When he took that action and voted for the Fordney-McCumber tariff, my friends, and set up that artificial stimulation for the manufacturing interests of America, he condemned every farmer in the land from which I come that raises cotton, he condemned him to compete with every peasant that walks along the banks of the Nile, and he condemned every farmer in the South that gives of his toil and of his industry and of his labor and of his land to the production of a fabric that the world must wear, he condemned him to compete with every East Indian who raises cotton in the jungles of India.

My friends, no system like that which compels one branch of our country to compete in the world markets with its industry and with its toll and artificially sets up a preference, a bounty, a gift, to one particular industry and obtains that gift from taxing the other portions of our citizenship, whether they will or whether they will not, no system like that can ever result except in producing the very condition of which the gentleman from Iowa now complains. Why, the whole theory of the gentleman's bill is that the Government has artificially created benefits for industry and that the Government has artificially created special privileges for the railroads, and having created these reserved seats, as it were, at the prosperity table, then the law has got to come along and create a similar benefit for the agricultural interests and put them up on a reserved seat.

If the gentleman could do that by law and could equalize all of the industries of our country and put them on the same plane, he would be just where he was before he started that system of preferences and particular benefits to one particular industry. The trouble with the gentleman's proposition is he can not do it by law. He can do it only by undoing what he has already done. He might do it as to the domestic consumption of the article, but whatever gain he created here at home he would lose that gain when he sold the surplus, as he calls it, in the foreign market where it would have to compete with the rest of the world.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for just one interruption?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. And also the plan of the gentleman from Iowa is to continue this special privilege to the manufacturers without their paying anything for it, but if the farmer is to be let in on the same equality, he must pay an equalization fee in order to get it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thank my colleague from Texas for making the suggestion. The theory of the gentleman from Iowa is that while the manufacturer will continue to get his bounty by reason of the law, he will now set up a scheme whereby the farmer must carry on and finance his own operation—every farmer whether he belongs to some particular organization or not will have to pay a compulsory tax in order to create a fund to transact the business which this special scheme sets up.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I understand the gentleman says that our farmers are now in competition with the peasants of Europe in the production of cotton.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. If we tear down the tariff walls as the gentleman claims we should, we bring down the laboring men to the standard of the wages of the laborer in Europe and all along the line.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, I knew that, although the gentleman when he began his remarks showed some evidence of having seen some little bit of light when he said that he wanted to lower the tariff on aluminum, he was willing to lower the tariff a little bit on steel, I thought he had begun

to see the light and say that he would no longer be a party to the tariff scheme that impoverishes agriculture and enriches industry; but the same old virus is at work under the surface. He is still tied to the tariff. By his question he indicates now that whatever his words might have been in the speech he made 30 minutes ago when the time comes to tear down the top rail—and gentlemen, we shall be satisfied to tear off some of the rails at a time. We shall not insist on tearing off all the rails at once, because we know you will not let us. [Laughter.]

But in tearing off even the top rail of the tariff and lowering it a little bit we know the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], when the roll is called, will vote "no" quietly and then slip out into the cloakroom again, and he will be found standing just where he stood when the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill was enacted into law. When the manufacturers call the roll the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] will be found voting the way they want him to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. How does the gentleman from Texas account for the fact that in 1920 and 1921 under the Underwood tariff law farm products were at the lowest point from the standpoint of purchasing power they have ever been in the history of our country?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Texas does not account for the fact, because it is not a fact.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If the gentleman will consult the price index he will find that it is so.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman is undertaking to find an excuse. He comes from that section of the country where his constituents are seeing a little bit of light, and my remarks have directed his attention to the sore spot and he could not keep his seat. He had to get up and say something to put in the RECORD along that line to justify his conduct. I am not talking about the Underwood bill. I am talking about the Fordney-McCumber bill. I am not talking about history. I am talking about a condition—a present condition. Now, let us see. Is not the gentleman willing to take off a little bit of the tariff?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. We are willing to take off some of the tariff on some things that do not need so much protection, but we are not willing to take off enough to destroy American labor or the American manufacturers, so as to destroy the home market for the American farmer. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand the gentleman exactly. He is willing to say that he might take it off for the purpose of satisfying his people, but he is not willing to take off enough to do any good. [Laughter.] Now, on what articles is the gentleman willing to take off the tariff? I yield in my own time for the gentleman to get up and now name the commodities from which he is willing to take off the tariff. He sits there and says nothing. [Laughter.] Now, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I want simply to make a statement that during the life of the Underwood tariff law the purchasing power of the farmer as compared with the purchasing power of industry was the largest in the history of the country.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thank my colleague for that statement. The records prove it. Under that law our exports were the largest on record. I do not want gentlemen to get the idea that I have any particular objection to gentlemen interrupting me. It is helpful.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I have in my office, and placed it in a tariff speech I made at the last session of Congress, a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Wallace and Secretary of Agriculture Jardine which shows that during the eight years of the Wilson administration the average purchasing power of the farmer was \$1.04, and last November it was 60.3 cents. We have that on the authority of two Republican Secretaries of Agriculture.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And that is the only reason to doubt it. [Laughter.] Let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky, however, that those statistics have appeared in the RECORD from time to time, and everybody knows that they are official. Everybody knows that they are true, unless it be some gentlemen who want to escape the logic of those statistics and close their eyes to figures and their minds to conviction.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does the gentleman contend that the war period was a normal period in which to compare purchasing power? The gentleman knows that during the war you could

not ship agricultural products from Russia, Australia, or South America because of the lack of shipping?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman has explained the subject entirely and thoroughly to his own satisfaction. Of course, the war was not a normal period, but the gentleman did not confine his statement to any particular period when he propounded his inquiry as to the purchasing power of the dollar under the Underwood bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I propounded the question with reference to the years 1920 and 1921.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, anyone can pick out some little isolated instance away out yonder and undertake to generalize from that particular situation. The years 1920 and 1921 were not normal years while war deflation was upon us. I ask the gentleman what about the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar now, at this time? He refers to something that is history. It is our duty not to be worrying about what happened 20 years ago.

While you are here debating about what happened under somebody's else administration or during the war, the farmers are in distress and they need relief now, not 10 years ago. I believe we ought to address our attentions and labors to solving the problem now.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Did not the farmers' distress commence when the prohibition law, called the Volstead Act, was enacted? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman wants to know if the farmers' distress did not begin with the enactment of the prohibition law. Of course, everybody knows that that is not propounded seriously. I know a good many farmers who were in much greater distress before the prohibition law than they have been since. If all of them were in the condition that the gentleman from Wisconsin evidently wants to make it easier for them to get in, it would not make any difference to them whether they had any money or not. They would think they had anyway. [Laughter.]

Probably the gentleman believes that if they had more liquor, that even if they had less money, they would not care. Evidently the gentleman from Wisconsin wants a return of that condition that is illustrated by a story which Senator HEFLIN tells about one of his constituents down in Alabama. A gentleman was preparing to move from Alabama to Texas. He was telling his friends good-by one night at the bar. He looked around as he was ordering the drinks and saw a fellow in rather ragged clothes and woe-begone expression, with whiskers four or five days' old, who looked as though he was in great despair, so he asked him to join them, and while they were indulging themselves in the good old-fashioned way, which the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to see return, this ragged individual spoke to his entertainer and said, "Well, they say you are going out to Texas." "Yes, I'm going out to Texas." "Well, you know I have a brother out in Texas, who lives out somewhere near Dallas. If you see my brother I want you to tell him that I have had an awful bad year. Under this tariff law we got nothing for our produce, nothing for our cotton, and have to pay high prices for everything we buy. My wife has been sick and the doctor's bill piled up, and one of my children died and I have the undertaker's bill facing me, and I just want you to tell my brother, if you see him, that if he ever expects to do anything for me, to do it now."

Senator HEFLIN's constituent said that he certainly would convey the message to his brother if he should ever see him. After they had had another drink or so the ragged man again approached his entertainer and said, "Well, you say you are going out to Texas?" "Yes; I am going out to Texas." "Well, I've got a brother out there in Texas who lives somewhere near Dallas, and if you see him I just want you to tell him that I am doing pretty well; that I made a fairly good crop and got a pretty fair price for it, and that I am getting along all right." They had two or three more drinks, and finally the man who was going to Texas said, "Well, I have just got to go now, boys, good-by," and one of them said, "Oh, now, we have had some drinks on you, let us have one more on me." This beraggle fellow took another drink with them, and just as the man who was going to Texas was leaving, he said, "Well, my friend, you say you are going out to Texas?" "Yes; I am going out to Texas; good-by." "I just want to say that I have a brother out in Texas who lives somewhere near Dallas, and if you happen to see him you just tell him that if he wants any money or anything to let me know." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was undertaking to discuss this matter seriously when the presence and the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] were so reminiscent of that old period that it had the effect of diverting me, for a time, from the course of my remarks.

This whole question is a question of relative values. If a dollar to-day in the markets of the country would buy twice as much stuff as it does buy, the man who had the dollar would be practically twice as well off as he is now. So when you by law create an artificial price for one particular commodity, for the protection of one particular industry, and levy a tribute on other industries to supply that artificial bounty, in so doing you automatically, inexorably, without any equivocation or secret evasion of mind thereby subtract from the other industries that which you give to the favored industry. The gentleman from Wisconsin is big and strong when you stand him up by some fellow who is little and weak. One man is rich when you measure him by another man who is poor. One man is handsome when you measure him by some other man who is not. And so it runs all through economic life. When you give to one man you must take away from another man. I want to do something for agriculture.

I wonder if these gentlemen over here who believe so much in the tariff would be in favor of establishing a great governmental export corporation whereby the Government, in order to stimulate agricultural exports, cotton, wheat, corn, rice, would be willing to take enough out of the five or six hundred millions of dollars that are put into the Treasury through the tariff law on imports to pay an export bounty on agricultural exports in order to stimulate the foreign market in the purchase of the surplus that these gentlemen are always talking about. You could put a very small export bounty on agricultural products, and what would it do? It would not only increase the price the farmer would get for his exports, but it would stimulate the domestic price, because the domestic market would respond to the foreign market, and if that product was started to Europe, the domestic purchaser, in order to keep it at home, would have to meet the foreign price plus the export bounty. It works perfectly the other way with imports coming in.

The gentleman favors the import bounty. They believe that is sound. But I will wager there is not a man, not even the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], not a high-tariff Republican, who will get up on this floor and say that he believes in and advocates it. I think, my friends, it is worth considering and worth studying whether or not the United States Government through some means might not stimulate the export of agricultural products. You advocate artificial stimulants to favorite industries. It may not be sound basically, but it is as sound as the old protective principle is sound. Wherever you are able to tax all the people in order to give benefit to one particular industry, is it not fair to take whatever you get out of that economic condition and give it back to the people who have created that fund? Of course, if we could control production in this country, as the industries are able to control their products, the question of an agricultural surplus would absolutely disappear. The trouble with the farmer and with agriculture is that they are not able, so large are the numbers engaged, so diversified, so far flung are the interests of agriculture, that through their own efforts they are not able to control production.

One of the helps is to reduce the acreage in certain products and try to secure a more balanced agriculture, and if possible, to stimulate consumption by every effort both abroad, at home, and elsewhere, stimulate consumption in agricultural products. Now in closing, my time is about gone—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield me two minutes?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Let me say in closing to the gentleman from Iowa. I hope that he and others who are so anxious to give some economic relief can through the committee of this House work out a plan that will be beneficial to agriculture and yet be basically sound. They were not able to do it last session, but I trust that they will be able to do it at this session of Congress. And let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that he gets up here and says that on some sweet day, at some other session of Congress, at some other year, some other time he might be willing to take the tariff off of aluminum or off steel a little bit. Now, let me say to the gentleman if he wants relief in that regard and those who sit on that side want such relief, I want the gentleman from Iowa to lead his followers in reducing the tariff now.

Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa if he can resurrect the old Iowa idea he talks about and let that idea evidence itself in action and not in words, and those similarly disposed on his side of the House will do what he says he wants to do, reduce the tariff on some of the articles the farmer has got to buy from the great industries which have been enriched by the law, why wait until next year, next Congress—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why wait until the next Congress or next year? The gentleman may not be here years to come. I hope he may be, but he might not. The outraged farmers of Iowa might call him to the governorship of the State of Iowa, or something of that kind, and he might not be here. Why does not the gentleman come over here now? I do not ask him to come over here; I will come over there. If the gentleman has the courage, he will at this session bring in a joint resolution or bill or legislative device whereby we can scale down this iniquitous tariff and give immediate relief to the farmers now instead of some other time.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. There is no tax on cotton, and I can not see where a reduction of tariff would scarcely help out.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is simple. The answer to that problem is really too simple. There is no tariff on cotton, and a tariff on cotton would be of no aid, but if an old fellow got a dollar for his cotton and goes out to buy the things and the necessities which he has to buy, and which cost him now \$1.50 and with a reduction of the tariff he can buy them for a dollar, does not the gentleman understand it will benefit him in some way? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Now, let me say in closing that if the gentleman will act now, he will not need to bring in a general bill, but simply do as the President suggested with reference to taxes—the percentage reduction of taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Can the gentleman give me another minute?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] when we talk about a general reduction of taxes at this session of Congress the President says, "Oh, no; the short session, of course, is no time to make a general reduction; simply adopt a joint resolution providing that the present rates will be continued, but when you come to pay them scale them down 15 per cent or 20 per cent or 25 per cent. It is perfectly simple and easy and requires no amendment and no general debate. Bring it in and shoot it through in 20 minutes."

If the gentleman will bring in a resolution or bill of that kind reducing the tariff rates, I shall be glad to join him; if he will get the Committee on Ways and Means, in behalf of struggling, stricken, and wounded agriculture, to bring in a joint resolution providing a flat tariff reduction, we will not need a general revision of the tariff, because we know what will happen in the case of a general revision, when all the diverse interests will be there knocking for favors at the doors of the Committee on Ways and Means.

But bring in a resolution reducing every tariff rate on the statute books 20 per cent or 30 per cent or 40 per cent or 50 per cent, and we can put it through the House readily if the gentleman from Iowa means what he says and if those who go with him mean what they say when they try to make the people of Iowa think that is what they mean. If they vote as they talk, we can reduce the tariff under the rates of the Fordney bill 50 per cent, and you will find that the dollars your farmers get from your wheat and your corn and your hogs out in Iowa will buy more aluminum goods and more steel that goes into the farmer's equipment, and even more clothes that the people out in Iowa in their stricken condition must wear, and all the other necessities of life, than do the dollars that the farmer has now in his pocket.

If the gentleman did not mean it when he said he believed the tariff ought to be reduced, why did he get up on the floor and say it ought to be reduced? If he believed that the tariff ought to be reduced, why did he postpone it to some indefinite time off in the future? If it ought to be reduced, it ought to be reduced

now. [Applause.] Not next year, but now; not after Mr. Lowden is nominated for President, but now.

It was very unkind for the gentleman from Iowa in his closing remarks to make some undue—and I am sure unwise—remarks about a presidential third term and that the incumbent of the presidential chair has served two terms in the Presidency. Why do some of the leaders on the Republican side want to snipe behind the lines? [Laughter.]

Why do you want to go back on the record of the Executive now in office? You know it is claimed that he has had only one term in fact. He was in the White House for an unexpired term to which he succeeded as Vice President, but the political experts now will tell you that that was not a term at all; that he was not President at all in that term but was simply Vice President acting as President, and they aver that under the Constitution he did not become President, but was really still Vice President, performing the duties of President, and when he was elected in 1924 that was the first term for which he was elected; and therefore in 1928 when the gentleman from Iowa will go up to the Republican National Convention with the delegates' credentials in his pocket, with a rubber stamp on them marked "Calvin Coolidge," he will be nominated then only for his second term and not for a third term.

Why does not the gentleman want the President renominated? Does he not believe in continuance in office for efficient public servants? The gentleman from Iowa himself is here in his fourth term, or perhaps fifth term, because his record has pleased the people of his State. The President tells you that there is prosperity in every corner of the land. Does not the gentleman from Iowa understand that there is prosperity out in Iowa among the wheat farmers?

I observe the Speaker sitting here on the left. I am glad to see him interested in this debate. I have spoken here now for 20 minutes in behalf of the American farmer. I have not hitherto, up to this moment, had the pleasure of having the Speaker of the House sit in my audience, but since I got to the third-term discussion the Speaker of the House has emerged from his study, which is congested with work on great governmental problems, and does me the honor not to sit on the back seat, not in the cloak room, peering out of a door, but does me the honor to sit on the front row in the "Amen" corner. [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, unless the Republican Party is prepared to repudiate the record of the present Executive; unless the Republican Party is willing to admit to the country that the present administration under the Republicans is not a success; unless the Republicans are ready to admit that this boasted prosperity of which the President so often prates is not real, that it is only artificial, only a picture painted on the canvas and not the substance, simply a moving picture on a screen and does not represent reality, how in the name of common sense are you going to refuse to nominate Mr. Coolidge for a third term? I believe he will be nominated for a third term. I do not want to see you utilize the President to serve every great interest in this country—I do not want you to make him the executive servant of the great corporations and the great trusts—I do not want you to be ungrateful for the willing service of the President as he stands at the outer door of the Manufacturers' Association, with his ear attuned to every sound that emanates from behind the glass doors, while he says, "Gentlemen, what do you want me to do?" I do not think it is fair and right to utilize the President's service to every important manufacturing industry for eight long years and then when he says, "I would like to serve you four more years," have you say, "Mr. President, we are willing to accept your services and the benefits you have conferred, but we have other adherents of the Republican Party who have served us faithfully, although in minor positions, and we think it is now their time to sit in the White House."

We think it is now their time to put on the red livery of the corporations; we think it is now their time to have the nomination as a reward for faithful services in the past and as a reward for the obsequiousness that has characterized their conduct as they served us. Were they not faithful to us as they stood around just before election time with bulging pockets over in Pennsylvania and in Illinois—with bulging pockets just before election? Mr. President, we have other faithful friends.

I think, my friends, they are entitled to something for their servitude and for the willingness that they have always evidenced to do all that these great interests wanted them to do—the interests that are on the top of these farmers and which will stay on top of the farmers as long as the gentleman from Iowa votes like he does with the ruling spirits of the Republican Party. He goes over and eats flapjacks in the White

House every time he gets a chance, and I suppose his only justification with the farmers back in Iowa is that by eating corn cakes and sausage he is increasing the consumption of farm products. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN]. [Applause.]

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, during the World War the officials of this Government appealed to the citizens throughout the country for aid and said it was time that every man in this Nation should do his bit toward the winning of the war. There were many appeals, and more effort put forth for increasing the manufacture of our raw materials into manufactured products, and for the cultivation of our lands for the production of foodstuffs to be consumed, not alone by the soldiers and citizens in this country but to be used as supplies and foodstuffs for the armies of our allies, than in any other like period in the history of this Government. Our young men, in many instances, left the farms and went to the factories. Our old men and our women were left upon the farms; smaller children who were not large enough to go into the Army or to leave the farms were all called into service, and for the few years during the war and those immediately following it, perhaps, we produced as much foodstuffs in this country as was ever produced in America under like circumstances. I mention this to show you that the farmer did his bit, but the time has now come, gentlemen, when, in my opinion, someone else and some agency, other than the agricultural classes of this country, should do their bit. It is a very poor citizen indeed who is unwilling to support his Government, and it is not a very creditable thing for any government or government official to fail, either in time of peace or in war, to back up and encourage its citizens in every way possible. [Applause.]

The farmers of the South, of the West, and of the great Northwest are to-day confronted with one of the greatest farm problems in the history of this country, and I want to ask you gentlemen as serious, reflecting American citizens: Is this Government doing what it can and what it should to protect the interests of those classes? It is only a question of time when not only will the farmers be affected but every manufacturing industry and every mercantile enterprise from one end of this great Government to the other will be affected just as seriously as the farmer is affected at this time. [Applause.] These conditions are national and may become international. Therefore it is the duty of every man to see that the Government does all that it can at this time to ameliorate the conditions which threaten ruin to the interests of this Nation.

I hate to place myself in the position of saying that any official of this Government has failed or is failing to do his bit in this hour of distress; but, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, if I may rely upon a paper published in my own State, which has the respect and confidence of all who know it, the evidence is very convincing that right here in Washington among the officials of this Government there are those employed to represent the Government at this time who have it in their power to help agricultural conditions and yet, instead of helping, are doing their bit toward making conditions worse. As a basis for this assertion I ask that the Clerk may read at this time an extract taken from the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Macon Telegraph, December 9, 1926]

GOVERNMENT PROHIBITS USE OF AMERICAN GROWN COTTON IN CONTRACTS FOR SHIRTING—LEGAL DOCUMENT PREFERS PRODUCT OF FOREIGN COUNTRY TO THAT OF UNITED STATES

THE TELEGRAPH BUREAU,
105 Kimball House.

ATLANTA, December 8.—Not only has the United States Government completely ignored the request of the governor of one of the "cotton States" to withhold the award of contracts for jute twice long enough to merely examine into the feasibility of using American-grown cotton instead of imported jute but it now develops that United States Government contracts which have been let for shirting specifically prohibits the use of American cotton in these goods and bases the contract on the use of Egyptian cotton.

In other words, the Government, which is supported largely by the tax it exacts from the agricultural peoples of the South, is placed in the position of prohibiting the expenditure of money which really belongs to those people for the produce grown by them and writes into a legal document not only that prohibition but a demand that the raw material, Egyptian cotton, a direct competitor to American cotton, be used in the manufacture of goods which the United States Government buys with American tax money.

These facts came out of the office of Gov. Clifford Walker to-day, with the comment by him that this procedure not only is unfair and unseemly, but is "downright criminal."

Recently Governor Walker, being advised of an award about to be made by the Post Office Department for 1,500,000 pounds of jute twine, wrote the postal and other Federal authorities in Washington, asking that the award of this contract be held up long enough to look into the practicability and advisability of using twine made from American cotton instead. The purpose was to bring about some form of cooperation on the part of the Federal Government with the cotton farmers of the South. Not only was the request not complied with, according to information here, but it was actually ignored.

CONTRACTS AWARDED

Then came information to the governor of large contracts recently awarded by the United States Government to New England spinners for shirting—a cloth commonly made from American cotton and sold all over the Nation as an American cotton product—with the provision written in the contracts carrying a mandatory requirement that the goods be made from Egyptian cotton. Against this Governor Walker has again entered a solemn protest in the name of the State. Letters have been written to the President, to both Georgia Senators, and to Members of Congress. Following is a copy of his letter to Congressman W. W. LARSEN, which is similar to letters written other Georgia Representatives in Washington:

"DEAR MR. LARSEN: I acknowledge receipt of your letter, and, in behalf of the farmers of the South, I desire to express my appreciation of the valuable assistance you are rendering in the movement to increase the uses of cotton and cotton products.

"You are reminded that, prosecuting the campaign to secure additional uses for cotton and cotton products, we discovered that the Government at Washington was advertising for 1,500,000 pounds of twine, the specifications requiring that twine to be made from imported jute instead of cotton. We requested that the award of bids be delayed, giving us a chance to demonstrate that cotton twine could be used just as satisfactorily and just as economically.

"I am advised that the Post Office Department has taken the position that they are bound by the strict letter of the law, which requires them to award the bids to the cheapest product. No attention has been paid, so far as I have been able to ascertain, to our suggestion that the Post Office Department hold up awarding the bids until the matter could be adjusted on such a basis as to justify the economical use of cotton in preference to imported jute. I regret that no such effort seems to have been made by the President, Mr. Hoover, or Mr. Meyer, who was appointed by the President to cooperate with the cotton farmers of the South.

"You will be interested to know that I am to-day in receipt of official notice that the Government recently entered into a contract for shirting for use of the Government, the specifications requiring the use of Egyptian cotton. This is not only perfectly ridiculous but, in my judgment, criminal in view of the straits of cotton farmers of the South.

"I trust you will investigate this matter and continue the fight. We shall certainly demonstrate whether the Government officials are sincerely interested in the farmers of the South.

"With an expression of my high personal esteem and good wishes,

"Very sincerely yours,

"CLIFFORD WALKER, Governor."

Subsequent to the release by Governor Walker of his letter to Congressman LARSEN, the matter was taken up with some officials of agricultural organizations, and it is understood some formal action will be taken by them drawing attention of Congressmen, not only from Georgia but from the other cotton-producing States, to the facts brought out by Georgia's governor, and some congressional action in all probability will be asked which will require the Government to give at least first consideration to domestic raw materials before buying the same or similar finished products made of imported materials which are in competition with American farms.

JOHN W. HAMMOND.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, in justice to the Post Office Department, I wrote the purchasing agent, or called him over the phone, and asked for his explanation as to why this contract had been or was sought to be awarded for jute twine instead of cotton twine. He wrote me a letter in which he said that the lowest quotations on jute were 12½ cents a pound, and that the lowest quotations received on cotton came from North Carolina, and were 20.75 cents per pound. He contends that under the law he is forced to award the contract to the party who makes the lowest and best bid, but I contend, as does the Governor of Georgia, and others, that the lowest and best bid did not mean the yardage, but the quality of the product purchased. The cotton farmers, and manufacturers of cotton products desired and requested an opportunity to be heard on the matter. Yet, the Government, without granting the courtesy of a hearing, proceeded to award the contract. Why? Did the circumstances or conditions justify such hasty action? I do not think so.

And it is that question to which I call your attention. I contend, and I do so upon the statement and authority of others

who are in a good position to know, that the difference between jute and cotton twine as set forth in the letter from the department do not mean that jute represents the lowest bid and is the cheapest twine to be used. The twine purchased is used for wrapping packages, and on the basis of yardage it requires more jute twine than it would cotton twine for wrapping these packages.

For instance, in order to wrap a package substantially with jute twine it should be wrapped two, three, or four times, while with cotton twine once or twice. Therefore, in the actual consumption of the product purchased, the Government would get just as much service, if not a cheaper commodity, in buying the cotton twine.

This is the question the cotton farmers and manufacturers wanted to be heard upon. It is a question they have a right to be heard upon, and it is a question, gentlemen of the committee, which in my opinion, if they were heard upon, they would win out in the contest. [Applause.] But whether or not they win, they are certainly entitled to the privilege of being heard. The farmers of this country during the war heard every cry and every appeal that was made from the War Department, that was made from the Post Office Department, or that was made from any other department of this Government, and yet, when they are in dire need and distress and make an appeal to their Government that should rise to their assistance, just as they responded when it needed assistance, they can not be heard. Their requests are ignored.

The Government, through the Post Office Department, uses two and a half million pounds of jute twine per year. Thus you see it is a matter that concerns not alone the cotton farmers of the South, but also the manufacturers of cotton in New England and Southern States.

It was Ludlow & Co., one of the largest manufacturers of jute in New England, whose bid for the contract was accepted. The cotton producers of the South preferred that some other company have the contract rather than an importer of jute twine. It was to their interest and they desired to be heard, yet they were not given the opportunity. Some man who imports jute into this country from India, and from far across the sea, was given the preference by contract. Why, I do not know.

Not only that, but the Governor of Georgia says in this article, if he is quoted correctly, that he has official information that a department of this Government has awarded a contract for shirting and that there is written into the contract, words which specifically require that this shirting must be made from Egyptian cotton. Why all this preference to importers of Egyptian cotton? Why is such cotton preferred to American cotton? It is not so good as American. Why such discrimination against America?

My friends, I have been hearing, since I was a boy, that America had a complete monopoly in the production of cotton, but if you will investigate, I think you will find the statement is an error. For the year 1925 the cotton acreage of India, alone, was more than 26,000,000 acres—about 26,461,000 acres. In recent years Egypt has increased its acreage. Seventeen different countries throughout the British Empire are to-day growing cotton in competition with the American farmer. Their average production is more per acre and it is produced at less cost. What are we doing to meet the competition? Did you know, my friends, that a tax of twopence, or about 12 cents, is levied upon every bale of cotton that is imported into Great Britain from America? The sum amounts to about \$480,000 upon the 4,000,000 bales they import from America every year; and what do they do with it? It is given over to the British Empire Cotton Growing Corporation to be used in fostering the production of cotton in India, in Australia, in Africa, in Egypt, Sudan, and other Provinces.

The American farmer is helping to pay the bill, and according to this press statement officials of the Government are discriminating against American farmers and American interests and in favor of importers of jutes from India and cotton from Egypt. The Government, which is supposed to protect the American cotton grower and the American manufacturer of cotton goods, does not even give them a chance to be heard before the officials of the Post Office Department. Has this splendid army, which we are maintaining as a division of the Government, awarded a contract for shirting specifically specifying that the goods must be made from Egyptian cotton? If so, I wonder whether in case of war, they would be willing, when it came to drafting soldiers to fight their battles in defense of the Republic, to rely upon a draft of Egyptian boys. [Applause.] If they are not willing to depend in their hour of need on men across the sea to increase the ranks of the Army, they have no right at this or other time to depend upon the American farmer, and the Government should not tax him to pay the Army's bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LARSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not a fact that long staple, sea island American cotton grades higher and is considered better than the Egyptian long-staple cotton?

Mr. LARSEN. Generally speaking, that is correct.

Mr. LOZIER. And is it not also true that it is the policy of the British Empire now being put into effect to encourage the production of cotton in all the Provinces and in all the dominions in order to take from America the preeminence in cotton which she has enjoyed for 100 years?

Mr. LARSEN. In answer to that question I will say that as far back as 1902, almost a quarter of a century ago, the British spinners, realizing the conditions the gentleman mentions, realizing that the American farmers held the key to the situation, set about to increase the production of cotton throughout the British Empire. They expended large sums of money to increase production of cotton in the Empire. In 1915 while the war was on they appointed a committee whose business it should be to ascertain the best methods of growing and producing cotton in the British Empire so that they could be independent of the American grower. That committee did not report until 1919, after the war. When the committee made its report the British Government appropriated one million pounds sterling, or about \$5,000,000, to enable the cotton corporation to go out into the different provinces of the empire and increase the growth of cotton.

To-day the British Empire is doing everything possible to produce within its dominions all the cotton it needs and to become absolutely independent of the American farmer. They only use annually at this time about 4,000,000 bales of American cotton, and when they increase production by that amount they will probably be independent of the American cotton grower. We had a carry over last year of about 4,000,000 bales.

We have a production this year of about 18,000,000 bales. This means bankrupt prices to the American grower. If the men in authority in this Government do not aid the cotton farmer, if they do not find some method whereby the producer of cotton can market it, at least at cost of production, then the Government itself must, in a measure, suffer. When the industries of this country fail, when they can no longer pay a tax to support the Government, every branch of the Government and every industry in the Nation must be injuriously affected. It is an insane policy and an unjust one which discriminates against the American farmer. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this is not a sectional question, and it is not a question that concerns the cotton producer alone, but is a matter that concerns this Government. Every interest is vitally affected. The man in New England, the consumer in the West, the manufacturers everywhere—all are vitally affected. We must take hold of the situation and remedy it as soon as possible.

Last year there was imported into this country, free of duty, from India and elsewhere 62,470 tons of jute and manufacturers of jute, worth \$11,996,582; jute butts, free of duty, to the amount of 2,081 tons, worth \$312,496; jute waste bagging and sack cloth to the amount of 16,130,212 pounds, valued at \$520,678; jute burlaps to the amount of 625,815,937 pounds, worth \$85,027,954; jute bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and so forth (duty paid), \$3,473,699; woven jute fabrics (duty paid), 2,012,413 pounds, valued at \$739,873; jute bags or sacks (duty paid), 48,070,063 pounds, valued at \$5,946,374; jute yarns to the amount of 776,838 pounds valued at \$113,018 and other manufacturers of jute to the amount of \$360,385. This immense amount of jute was worth in the aggregate \$108,491,009 and every ounce of it came into direct competition with cotton and other products produced by the American farmer. It is time that the American farmer and the American business man, as well as the consumers of American products, were waking up to the seriousness of this situation. If we are to preserve American agriculture and American institutions we must, so far as possible, prefer and use American products instead of foreign commodities. Our first allegiance is to the American farmer. When he is unable to supply our needs, it will be time enough to import goods from foreign markets which come into direct competition with our own agricultural products.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Do all of those commodities the gentleman speaks of come in direct competition with our cotton?

Mr. LARSEN. Generally speaking; yes. They come into direct competition with both cotton and hemp produced in this country.

Mr. DENISON. Is there a tariff on these articles?

Mr. LARSEN. On some there is and on some there is not.

Mr. DENISON. Would it not help the farmer if we put a tariff on it?

Mr. LARSEN. I realize that I have not the same idea on this question as the gentleman from Illinois has. I think the interests of the farmer would be best served by taking the tariff off of articles that he consumes.

Mr. DENISON. Would it not help the farmer if we put a tariff on these articles that the gentleman mentions?

Mr. LARSEN. Jute bagging has a duty on it to-day and quite a number of other jute products have a duty. Whatever protection the Republican Party proposes to give the American farmer by levying that duty on jute has inured to the benefit of the farmer, but, notwithstanding this assistance, they are going into bankruptcy everywhere.

Mr. DENISON. Personally I would be in favor of increasing the tariff on jute.

Mr. LARSEN. I desire to emphasize the point that any red-blooded American citizen selected by the American people to serve in the War Department the great Post Office or other departments, should have enough American manhood, enough American spirit, to stand by and exercise the functions in favor of the American citizen. [Applause.] A man who is supported by the taxpayers' money should be patriotic enough and big enough to stand by the American farmer. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I trust that you will bear with me for the 15 minutes allotted me by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN]. I am not going to make any nomination for either the Democratic or the Republican Party. I dare say that important function will be discharged by selected delegates in convention in each instance assembled for that purpose. I am not going to discuss the tariff, because, after all, the controversy that has raged in and around that subject since the beginning of the Government apparently has not gotten us very far in the way of bringing intellectual conviction to the masses of the people in any generation since the arguments, pro and con, began. The discussions appear to be more humorous in some instances and rancorous in others than logical. At any rate, I am satisfied that the tariff is institutional with our people and Government, and I do not think there will be any great modification of that viewpoint for many years to come. In so far as my observations have permitted me to view the matter, I never really could see any great difference between the Democratic and the Republican attitude with respect to the tariff. There is a statue down on Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue erected to commemorate the military glory and renown of Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock. I heard a facetious fellow, wittily inclined, one day remark that General Hancock's military exploits would be forgotten, but that he will be immortalized in American history because he said "The tariff is a local issue," and that is what millions of Americans think it is. That viewpoint has been in evidence to-day. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is always forceful, eloquent, and pleasing in his address, came dangerously near, if I may use that word, to making a free-trade speech. He was followed by an equally learned and distinguished gentleman from another Southern State, the State of Georgia, who in effect, if not in essence, made a protective-tariff speech. I know that he will disclaim it, but his cry was for protection for American cotton and binding as against Egyptian cotton and Egyptian binding. I repeat, I do not know that I can add much to the subject, because it has been discussed almost interminably.

I understand that in years gone by the discussion led to such rancorous encounters that both the Democrats and Republicans were greatly disappointed when fisticuffs as an eventuality were not engaged in, very much like the celebrated Donnybrook Fairs fights in Ireland, where men seriously regretted, as a result of heated discussion, that some engagement had not taken place before 12 o'clock. In other words, political and oratorical opponents do not carry their belligerence as far now as they did some years ago, either here or across the seas. As I said, I do not intend to engage in controversy now or hereafter about the tariff question, but for the life of me I can not see how anyone could or can expect the American farmer to prosper permanently by practically annihilating American industry, by laying low our manufacturing enterprises, and pulling to the ground our great commercial organizations. I do not want to see such a day of ruin ever confront the American people. I do not want to see what I saw six or seven years

ago during the great depression, when I rode from here to Boston. I then saw great factory chimneys without a wreath of smoke coming from them, and men standing about with their hands in their pockets presenting such an aspect of gloom and disaster that apparently a cemetery would be a cheerful and inspiring place in comparison. That tragedy in our national life was caused, it is fair to say, by overproduction in our mills and industries and the deflation that necessarily follows every inflation, for it is axiomatic that the pendulum will swing back as violently as it moved forward. In other words, no sort of a tariff could have made or prevented, with all of the other causes operating to produce it. I can not see how anyone can expect America to prosper as a result of the tariff being razed to the ground or done away with entirely, although that is insupportable, because we are not going to commit such a folly as that merely in order to give the farmer a temporary advantage, because it would be a temporary advantage which would permit him to buy his needs entirely free of a tariff. I am for a reasonable protective tariff, I suppose, like the majority of my countrymen; and I can not help but make the observation—and I am not doing it for the purpose of embarrassing any of my colleagues from the South, where I was born and reared—that I remember some years ago when some Republican, I think facetiously, proposed a tariff on cotton of more than an inch and one-sixteenth in staple length that a great pandemonium and scampering was caused on the Democratic side because almost every fellow interested in cotton wanted to vote for that particular rate although he was most anxious that the balance of the tariff rates should be as low as possible.

In my judgment it would be inconceivable stupidity and fearful folly for us to destroy American industry, American commerce, merely for the purpose of gratifying temporarily the farmer by reducing the tariff to such a point where our commerce would go tottering to its destruction and fall. Of course, I feel a sympathetic interest in the farmer. As a matter of fact, all of my forebears, I suppose, for thousands of years, both male and female, came from the country. Mr. Bryan very felicitously said that you may burn down the cities and that the country will build them up, but that if you destroy the country the grass will grow in the streets of your cities. I have always thought there was considerable wisdom and fact in that attitude, and that the cities were to a large extent dependent upon the success of the country; but I am not in accord with the views expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], because in my judgment his proposal would destroy the American market and close it to the sale of farm products and by prostrating the millions who are not farmers involve the agriculturist in the general ruin. It would lead to economic disaster. You might apparently for a moment benefit the farmer, but you would have millions and millions of men interested in industrial and commercial life all go idle and penniless. The foundation, the mudsills of this country industrially, financially, commercially, is the protective system—protective in the largest and fullest significance of the word. One can not disturb that foundation fundamentally without shaking the whole superstructure to such an extent as to bring about a crash.

The Democratic platform, as I understand it, is a tariff for revenue, or, as that has been interpreted in recent years, a tariff that will cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. Clearly the revenue depends upon the rates—and the question of what rate will produce the most revenue is a matter of opinion. The policy of protection is based upon the idea that if the products of the steppes of Russia and the Nile are permitted to come in equal competition with American products the producers of these products will be necessarily forced into the same economic and social position. This conclusion, in my judgment, is inescapable. And if the big majority of Americans are reduced to the status of peons, fellahs, and coolies, with a purchasing capacity reduced to nil, how can the farmer remain prosperous under such conditions and surrounded by such an economic and social environment? But, enough of the tariff for to-day!

Mr. Chairman, I rose largely for the purpose of saying a few words in regard to what I consider a necessity for this country, if not immediately, then certainly in the near future. Senator du Pont endeavored to anticipate a coming necessity, in my judgment, in this country by introducing a bill providing for a great national highway running east and west. It is a very ambitious and comprehensive plan. It provides for a road, I believe, 500 feet in width—

Mr. ARENTZ. For a right of way of 500 feet.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. For a right of way of 500 feet, which in all probability will make for one of the greatest assets of this Nation, because it is unnecessary for me to point out that the great roads of this sort, perhaps, have been more

instrumental in bringing the various parts of the country into closer relationship and promoting companionship of the people and a larger interest than any other instrumentality brought into our national life. So I am absolutely in favor of that proposition. It seems to me that the suggestion of the Senator might have gone further and provided for a road over the old Spanish Trail, leading along the Gulf of Mexico largely and the southernmost parts of our country, but connecting the two oceans in just the way contemplated by the du Pont bill. I think, also, that a great national road might be run from north to south. I had the pleasure to make a trip recently on what is known as the "Palm to Pine" trip from New Orleans to Winnipeg. We left New Orleans in 40 automobiles, three and four persons to the car. There was a trip made three years ago by our Canadian cousins from Winnipeg to New Orleans, styled the "Pine to Palm," and we responded, and returned the visit, calling ours the "Palm to Pine" trip.

Mr. Chairman, in the beginning, I viewed that trip with a great deal of apprehension. I thought I was going to suffer a good deal of hardship, and I was not very enthusiastic at all; but I was assured by the mayor of the city of New Orleans and a great many other of my friends who exercise considerable influence in the city, that they felt I ought to go and speak in our many stops about the highways, waterways, and railroads and endeavor to communicate the attitude of Congress on these important matters as pleasantly as I could to our countrymen, and that in the trip was a great opportunity for public service. I undertook the trip most reluctantly, and I want to say it was not a hardship, but a great pleasure. Such is life, many of our forebodings vanish and the realizations are more agreeable than the anticipations. Leaving the city of New Orleans we rolled over gravel roads in Louisiana, which, in my judgment, are not excelled by any roads in the world, a great highway which led by Baton Rouge, Alexandria, and Shreveport in Louisiana to Dallas in Texas. Then coming back to the Jefferson Highway we skirted the Ozark Mountains, all through Oklahoma, on through inviting Kansas, lordly Missouri, wonderful Iowa, and Imperial Minnesota, and then over the line through the Province of Manitoba to Winnipeg. Coming back through the State of 10,000 lakes, we crossed the river at Duluth and got into Wisconsin. Before leaving Minnesota let me say, that if there is anything more inspiring in the industrial life of America than the Mesaba iron mines I have never seen it. It was in the fall of the year; the latter part of October. All nature seemed in tune. The splendor seemed to fall on everything, as well as "castle walls."

I do not believe that I will ever again behold such a perfectly wonderful riot of color, such an amazing number of shades in the seven primary colors as I noticed on the trees, the leaves of which were then beginning to turn, and turning rapidly, at that season of the year. I thought I had seen something that appealed to me as a glorious vision in the Shenandoah Valley some years ago, and that I would never behold the like again. From the foot of the Shenandoah Valley, looking up the mountain side, the trees looked like a million rose bouquets up in the air. But I must confess that the winter coloring that I saw in the scenery of Wisconsin will never be forgotten because of the impression it made on my mind. Vivid as a sunset, as sad as the death of day. I can understand why so many tourists go into that beautiful State and into the magnificent State of Minnesota.

The Mississippi River is one of the widest and greatest rivers of the world when it reaches New Orleans, where I was born and reared. It was a great pleasure to me to go into Lake Itasca where the headwaters of the Mississippi find their rise. It seemed so narrow at its source, at that point, that I could almost jump across it. The Jefferson Highway, over which we made the great trip, is a wonderful highway, and, I understand, in its progressive links furnishes as great a commerce as could be carried across the country from north to south by two great trunk lines. There is in the different sectors so much commerce as totals an amount equivalent to what would be carried by two great trunk lines equal to the Southern Pacific. That may be slight exaggeration, but it tends to show the value of this road. That road could be nationalized—that is, taken over by the Government under its interstate powers—and made as great an asset as the Spanish Trail when nationalized and the road in the contemplation of Senator du Pont.

I think, my friends, that this country's supremacy in years to come will rest upon its transportation facilities. I believe in the unification of waterways and highways and railways, so that we will have one great system, a splendid unit, that will make for economy in transportation, and which will, of course, beneficially affect commerce to a very appreciable extent. I believe also in the highways for the mobilization of our troops in the event the bugle blast ever calls our boys again to arms.

God grant that such a contingency may never come, but patriots know that kingdoms by blood gained must be by blood maintained, and that the great riches of this country are a challenge to the predatory instincts of other countries. I am for national roads. I am for see America first. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further general debate the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, namely:

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TREADWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 15008) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DECEMBER SALARIES TO CAPITOL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 305) authorizing payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1926, on the 20th day of that month

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, the Office of Legislative Counsel, and employees paid on the vouchers under authority of resolutions, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1926, on the 20th day of that month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. This is the usual resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT GALLIPOLIS, OHIO

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13504) to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio," approved May 13, 1926

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio," approved May 13, 1926, is amended by striking out the word "Kentucky" wherever it occurs in such act and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "West Virginia."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is to correct a typographical error?

Mr. DENISON. This is to correct a typographical error, which was not discovered until after the bill had become a law.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The committee was not able to distinguish between Kentucky and Virginia at the time?

Mr. DENISON. Well, some of us were not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DENISON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Committee on the Judiciary reported a bill of some importance and filed the report of the committee. I would like to ask to have until the 4th of January next to file minority views on that bill, H. R. 8902.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that members of the minority of the Judiciary Committee may have until the 4th of January to file minority views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The bill H. R. 6238 having passed the House, having been amended by the other body, and having come back to the House, may I ask what the status of the bill is?

The SPEAKER. On the request of the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration, the House not having taken any action or suggested any action, the Chair referred the bill to the Committee on Immigration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PRATT, for several days, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 16, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, December 16, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

Relating to certain cotton reports of the Secretary of Agriculture (H. R. 14245).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Independent offices; War Department; State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bills.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Expressing the approval of the United States Congress of the proposed international project to erect a memorial at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, to Christopher Columbus (H. Con. Res. 41).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Report on promotion and retirement by the Chief of Staff.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the admission to the mails as second-class matter bulletins and periodical publications issued by State boards and departments having jurisdiction over or engaged in promoting the conservation and development of natural resources (H. R. 8717).

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the sale of part of United States veterans' hospital property at Broadview, Ill. (H. R. 7745).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

787. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report with the facts in the claim of Mr. Ira E. King, postmaster at Stillwater, Minn., for credit on account of loss sustained in the burglary of the post office on December 5, 1925; to the Committee on Claims.

788. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report with the facts in the claims of Mr. Frank E. Shults, post-

master at Baraboo, Wis., for credit on account of loss sustained in the burglary of the post office on June 30, 1926; to the Committee on Claims.

789. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report with the facts in the claim of Mr. Roswell H. Bancroft, postmaster at Palisades, Colo., for credit on account of loss sustained in the burglary of the post office on August 2, 1924; to the Committee on Claims.

790. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report with the facts in the claim of Mr. Matthias R. Munson, postmaster at Prairie du Chien, Wis., for credit on account of loss sustained in the burglary of the post office on September 12, 1925; to the Committee on Claims.

791. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report with the facts in the claim of Mr. Fred A. Knauf, postmaster at Sheboygan, Wis., for credit on account of loss sustained in the burglary of the post office on October 17, 1925; to the Committee on Claims.

792. A letter from the adjutant general of the Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting a report of the Sixtieth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, held at Des Moines, Iowa, on September 19 to 25, 1926 (H. Doc. No. 591); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

793. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of the outer harbor of Fairport Harbor, Ohio, with a view to extending the breakwater and making other improvements (H. Doc. No. 592); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BOIES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 475. An act to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3444. An act to amend the act of February 11, 1925, entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 13500. A bill to amend section 176 of the Judicial Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13417) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Rankin; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13418) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Ridgway; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13419) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth May; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14202) granting a pension to Eliza Gibbs; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15044) for the relief of Fernando Montilla; Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 15077) for the relief of James Henry Payne; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 15205) to regulate the fees of clerks of United States district courts or deputies and assistants who may be appointed United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15206) providing for research and investigation by the Department of

Commerce of cotton and its by-products with a view to discovering additional commercial and scientific uses for cotton and its by-products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 15207) to create a Federal agricultural corporation to provide economic guidance of the production and the marketing of the basic commodities of agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 15208) to provide for the detention of fugitives apprehended in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 15209) to amend section 93, chapter 5, of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911, entitled "The Judicial Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 15210) to provide further aid to disabled veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BERGER: A bill (H. R. 15211) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 15212) to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 15213) to amend section 260 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 338) to investigate the United States Navy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 15214) granting a pension to Thresa Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 15215) for the relief of Paymaster Charles Robert O'Leary, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 15216) granting a pension to Cornelia A. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 15217) granting a pension to Isadora Maurer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 15218) granting an increase of pension to Eva F. Pinkney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15219) granting an increase of pension to Fanny L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15220) granting an increase of pension to Lida B. Elkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 15221) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 15222) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 15223) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Baton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 15224) granting a pension to Malinda C. Opdyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15225) granting an increase of pension to Ann Eliza Haley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 15226) to amend the military record of James M. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15227) granting a pension to Lucinda A. Pitzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15228) for the relief of Estle David; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 15229) granting a pension to Cornelius P. Cronin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 15230) to correct the military record of John T. Bandy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 15231) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Kunding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 15232) for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15233) for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 15234) for the relief of Emerson P. Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15235) for the relief of Mary A. Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIEFNER: A bill (H. R. 15236) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15237) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Cissell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 15238) granting a pension to Augustus St. Valentine Patten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 15239) granting an increase of pension to Grace E. Prior; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15240) granting an increase of pension to Nancy R. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15241) granting a pension to Anna Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 15242) granting an increase of pension to Rowena R. Coombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE of New York: A bill (H. R. 15243) granting a pension to Leverett Chappell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15244) granting an increase of pension to Willie Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 15245) granting an increase of pension to Anna McCaffrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15246) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Tullis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 15247) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Ayres; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15248) granting an increase of pension to William Blades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 15249) granting an increase of pension to Julia C. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15250) granting an increase of pension to Martha V. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 15251) granting an increase of pension to Anna D. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15252) to provide relief for certain natives of Borongan, Samar, P. I., for rental of houses occupied by the United States Army during the years 1900 to 1903; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15253) for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15254) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Staub; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15255) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15256) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Truitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 15257) granting an increase of pension to Edmonia V. Ballard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWOOPE: A bill (H. R. 15258) granting an increase of pension to Mary Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15259) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Lauth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15260) for the relief of Alice McCrea; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15261) granting a pension to Virginia Canterbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15262) granting an increase of pension to Emily Asbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15263) granting a pension to Emily J. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 15264) granting a pension to Commodore Perry Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 15265) granting a pension to Lillian I. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15266) granting a pension to Catherine M. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

By Mr. TOLLEY: A bill (H. R. 15267) granting an increase of pension to Anna Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDIKE: A bill (H. R. 15268) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Holzworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15269) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Thornbrough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15270) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Edlen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 15271) granting a pension to Elam Cason; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15272) for the relief of J. J. Creslein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 15273) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Dilden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 15274) for the relief of William Morin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 15275) for the relief of the Central of Georgia Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15276) for the relief of Mary F. Crim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 339) providing a clerk to the official reporters of debates and abolishing the office of assistant reporter of debates; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4353. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of various citizens of Wichita, Kans., for legislation for Indian war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

4354. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by Mr. Fred B. Lehan and 47 other citizens of Table Grove, Ill., stating their reasons for opposing the White radio bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4355. Also, petition by the city council of Quincy, Ill., urging the passage of the rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

4356. By Mr. MAGEE of Pennsylvania: Petition adopted by the Pennsylvania executive of the American Legion, urging immediate consideration of legislation which will appropriate sufficient funds to erect and maintain a thousand-bed neuropsychiatric hospital near Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4357. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Alexis Witte, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring amendment to the trading with the enemy act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4358. By Mr. SWING: Petition by certain residents of Santa Ana, Calif., for an acknowledgment of God in the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, December 16, 1926

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 15, 1926)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio," approved May 13, 1926;

H. R. 14827. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1926, on the 20th day of that month.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2855) for the relief of Cyrus S. Andrews, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14557) making appropriations for